

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. XVII

Summer Number, 1948

No. 3

EDITORIAL BOARD

NOLAN B. HARMON, JR., *Editor-in-Chief*

ERMINIE HUNTRESS LANTERO, *Assistant Editor*

JOHN BAILLIE
ROBBINS WOLCOTT
BARSTOW
SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT

GERALD CRAGG
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH
JOHN KNOX

KENNETH S. LATOURETTE
G. ASHTON OLDHAM
HOWARD C. ROBBINS
PAUL SCHERER

ADVISORY COUNCIL

John Keith Benton
Angus Dun
Paul Bentley Kern
John Alexander Mackay
Earl Bowman Marlatt

W. E. McCulloch
Arthur Cushman
McGiffert, Jr.
Robert Hastings Nichols
Richard Campbell Raines

Luther D. Reed
D. Elton Trueblood
Gregory Vlastos
Leslie D. Weatherhead
Luther A. Weigle

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Strategy of Co-operation Between Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, Samuel McCrea Cavert	323
Present Trends in Protestant Thought.....Nels F. S. Ferré	334
Families Should Worship Together.....Louise Parks Winfield	347
The Faith of Maxwell Anderson.....John D. Lee	357
The Liturgical Movement in Catholic Circles.....Gerald Ellard, S.J.	370
The Doctrine of the Remnant.....Carl K. Mahoney	382
Marriage and Love in Christian History.....Roland F. Bainton	391
St. Francis of the Plains.....Annabelle Wagner Bergfeld	404
The World Council of Churches—An English and Anglican View, Oliver S. Tomkins	408
The Forgotten Factor in Educating for Peace.....George P. Michaelides	417
Experiencing Albert Schweitzer.....Everett Skillings	423
When the Heart Sings.....Calvin T. Ryan	434
A Review of the Quarter's Fiction.....John C. Schroeder	445
Book Reviews	449

Copyright, 1948, by Stone and Pierce. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

Published by

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS

150 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

Who's Who?

ROLAND H. BAINTON, B.D., Ph.D. Titus Street Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

ANNABELLE WAGNER BERGFELD, B.A., State Teachers College. Public school teacher in Arlington, New Jersey, and contributor to educational and poetry magazines.

SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT, D.D. Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York City.

GERALD ELLARD, S.J., M.A., Ph.D. Professor of Liturgical Theology, St. Louis University School of Divinity, St. Marys, Kansas. Author of many books on liturgy.

NELS F. S. FERRÉ, A.M., B.D., Ph.D. Abbot Professor of Christian Theology, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts.

JOHN D. LEE, B.D., Ph.D. Associate Professor of Church History, Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia.

CARL K. MAHONEY, B.D., D.D. Superintendent, Pacific Northwest Conference, Seattle-Tacoma District, The Methodist Church, Seattle, Washington.

GEORGE P. MICHAELIDES, M.A., Ph.D. President of Schauffler College of Religious and Social Work, and Lecturer at Cleveland College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

CALVIN T. RYAN, A.M., Ed.M. Head of Languages Department and Acting Head of Fine Arts Department, State Teachers College, Kearney, Nebraska.

EVERETT SKILLINGS, M.A. Professor Emeritus of German, Middlebury College; Chairman of the Albert Schweitzer Fellowship in America, Middlebury, Vermont.

JOHN C. SCHROEDER, D.D., LL.D. Master of Calhoun College and Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

OLIVER S. TOMKINS, M.A. Assistant General Secretary, World Council of Churches Provisional Committee, London, England.

LOUISE PARKS WINFIELD, B.A. Formerly a missionary with her husband, Gerald F. Winfield, at Cheeloo University in China; now near New York City.

RELIGION IN LIFE is published quarterly by Abingdon-Cokesbury Press at 75 cents per copy. Subscription price, \$3.00 per year, \$5.00 for three years in the United States and possessions and Mexico; Canada, postage 18 cents per year additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents per year additional. For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by the Epworth Press, 25-25 City Road, London, E. C. 1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Publication office, 810 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tennessee. Editorial office, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York. Entered as Second Class Matter, August 26, 1942, at the post office in Nashville, Tennessee, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section 1102, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 16, 1923.

The Strategy of Co-operation Between Protestants, Catholics, and Jews

SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT

These three groups have great common interest in maintaining religious faith—but progress in fellowship is not made by glossing over differences.

IN SPITE OF the divergent backgrounds of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews they are all affected by the common moral and spiritual climate in which they now live. I suggest three aspects of the present situation which deeply concern them all and have an important bearing on their relations with one another.

I

Since August 6, 1945, we have all been living in *an atmosphere surcharged with a sense of moral crisis and of necessity for moral decision*. Not many years ago this emphasis on the critical condition of our society would have sounded rather strange. We then took the idea of steady progress for granted. We almost believed mankind was advancing in a straight line, as if carried onward and upward on a sort of cosmic escalator. Today any such outlook on life is fit only for a museum of antiquities. We know now that we stand at fateful crossroads, facing an inescapable decision. The announcement of Holy Scripture comes alive again: "I have set before thee this day life and death, blessing and cursing. Therefore choose life that thou and thy seed may live."

The ancient note of crisis finds modern expression in a haunting bit of verse by Mary White Slater in *The New York Herald Tribune*:

Little man, little man,
where have you been?
Farther and nearer
than ever were seen.

Little man, little man,
what did you there?
I wakened an atom
asleep in its lair.

I shattered the atom
and shuddered to find

RELIGION IN LIFE

A power to destroy
or deliver mankind.

In the lair of an atom
where no man had trod,
I came upon Lucifer
challenging God.¹

One of the reasons why we used to think in terms of constant progress was because we had unbounded faith in science. Until yesterday belief in science was almost the religion of the average American. But now we are startled to discover that science may turn out to be not a blessing but a curse. Everything depends on the purposes for which it is used. At last we see, as in a flash of lightning, that if we are to have such power as science now puts into our hands we must have enough spiritual insight and ethical discipline to use the power for life instead of death. Raymond B. Fosdick sums up our condition well when he says: "Our technologies have far outrun both our moral sense and our social organization. Our wisdom about ends does not match our skill about means, and a great gulf has opened between our engineering and our ethics."

We all have, also, a *deepening awareness of the secularization of life that has taken place*. The secular mood is not, of course, something new. Indeed, man's disposition to think of himself as the source of all meaning and value is as old as the Book of Genesis: "Your eyes shall be opened," the Tempter says, "and ye shall be as God." What is new is not the point of view but the extent to which it has come to dominate man's thought. This is most conspicuous in the field of public education. A secularized education does not involve an explicit denial of religious faith but it does involve an implicit denial of its importance for the major aspects of community life for the sake of which education is carried on. It leaves religion on the side-lines as if it had no significance for citizenship, vocation, and the social welfare. In our determination to avoid religious indoctrination in our schools, we have, by our silence, effectively indoctrinated successive generations with the notion that in anything beyond one's private opinion God may be ignored.

The secular and humanistic outlook has had its good side. It has helped to free man from the tyranny of ancient superstitions. It has been, in one respect, a needed protest against a kind of religion that had little

¹ "Huntman," in *The New York Herald Tribune*, July 14, 1947. Used by permission of the *Tribune* and the author.

or no relevance to the social conditions of man's life. But the type of mind that substitutes for the *Te Deum a Me Deum* lands mankind in anarchy. In the words of Emil Brunner, "a world with as many centers as there are human beings, that is the cause of all the chaos and disintegration in the world of man." And at last man's attempt to build a human order without any acknowledgment of the Divine Order is ending in his complete disillusionment. He no longer sings Swinburne's psalm of praise, "Glory to man in the highest, for man is the master of things." Instead he finds himself the slave of the very things he has created. His aeroplane, for example, which was expected to link distant peoples together in mutual helpfulness makes them live in mortal terror of one another.

As a result of the advanced stage of secularization at which our generation has arrived there is widespread moral bewilderment and confusion. Millions of people have become moral relativists. They do not believe there is any absolute or universal standard of right and wrong. They regard morality as simply a matter of changing customs. They think of business and industry and politics as autonomous in their own right, not subject to any higher law than that of self-interest or group power.

There is, however, *a dawning recognition that if we are to have vigorous morality we must also have religious faith.* Our American society still has great ethical objectives, it is true—such objectives as democracy and freedom and brotherhood. We have not renounced them as some of the organized movements in Europe have done. But how impotent these ideals seem in their effect upon our social and economic and political life! Why this feebleness? Is it not because those moral ideals are becoming divorced from the religious faith that produced them at the beginning of our national life and has nourished them from generation to generation? We have now come to a time in which it is casually taken for granted that we can keep our moral standards even though we give up our religious faith.

A diagnosis of our present condition suggests that the weakening of moral fiber passes through three successive stages. First there is a gradual, almost unconscious, loss of belief in God, an undermining of the conviction that there is any transcendent meaning in human existence, any ultimate frame of reference beyond the desires and impulses of man. While thus abandoning religious faith we mean, of course, to keep our moral standards. In the second stage, morality begins to break down

as a dynamic force able to give direction to the people's conduct. Through the influence of familiar patterns, however, the outer forms of morality still remain. In the third stage, even the outer forms of morality disappear—as, for example, in the regime of National Socialism. After the loss of any recognition of a Divine Order to which the human order must conform, there is no standard left except the will of anyone who is strong enough and clever enough to get what he wants. What begins as a loss of faith in God ends as a loss of faith in man.

What happens when we assume that we can continue to have a vital ethic without religious faith is illustrated in Robert E. Fitch's pithy parable:

Unto what, then, shall we liken the men and women of this generation? Are they not like unto a certain man who was very fond of his cream, but had no use for cows? Even as a young lad in the country, he was irked by the thought that there must be so many fields for the grain, so many hands to tend and to feed, so much early rising and working late, so many chores—all to the end of a cup of cream. Later on, when he was older, he ran away to live in the city. . . . One day he came to himself and said: "I shall put away all childish superstitions. Henceforth I no longer believe in cows! . . . In our modern age of technological advance and of cardboard containers, we do things better and more simply. Obviously, the cream comes out of the carton!" And for many years he continued in this conviction. But there came a time when all the laborers in the country had departed to the city, for they were weary with making and producing, and were content now to settle down to using and consuming. And it came to pass also at this time that there was no longer any cream, for there had ceased to be any cows.²

II

What does this picture of our present scene mean for our relations to each other as Protestants, Catholics, and Jews? Surely the primary thing which it suggests is that we have a great common interest in presenting a common front in the maintenance of religious faith. Whatever be the differences between us, they are of much less moment than the underlying unity which is theirs who share a common faith in God.

Another thing that is quickly suggested is that we cannot effectively meet the contemporary challenge by any thin and diluted version of faith. Only as any group that possesses an articulate and coherent interpretation of the meaning of human existence presents that faith, in its wholeness, to the world, can we hope to arrive at any body of truth that is significant enough to claim the loyalty of men.

² *A Preface to Ethical Living*, by Robert E. Fitch. Association Press, 1947, pp. 73f.

But the search for a common front of religious forces must not be allowed to beguile us into the superficial idea that there are no religious differences that matter. Any religion with saving power will have its own distinctive convictions which constitute its very *raison d'être*. We have been so enamored of the ideal of tolerance that there is a widespread but deceptive assumption that all our problems would be solved "if only people would forget their differences." Any such facile conception of tolerance must be sharply questioned. We shall never come to significant co-operation by any bland neutrality in the face of important differences.

The descent of the idea of tolerance into obscurantism reaches bottom in the oft-heard remark that "it doesn't matter what a man believes if only he is sincere." It would be hard to point out a more egregious fallacy. When you examine the slogan it turns out to be nonsense. If it makes no difference whether one believes in the law of gravity or not, why should we not jump out of top-story windows for the sheer exhilaration of such a form of exercise? If it makes no difference what we believe about people of other racial backgrounds than our own, why should we not treat them as Hitler treated the Jews? If it makes no difference what we believe about the character of ultimate reality, why should we not offer the bloody sacrifices that the goddess Kali demands instead of trying to obey a God who requires that we do justice and love mercy? The elementary truth is that we live as we believe and that a man will do right only when he believes right.

It will greatly conduce to sound relations among our religious groups if we can help them to see what a true tolerance would be. It cannot mean that all religious beliefs are equally valid. The realm of agreement may be wider than we realize, but there are points at which one view is true and another view is false. The belief that Jesus Christ is only one ethical teacher among others and the conviction that in him God uniquely entered into human life for man's redemption are not merely complementary aspects of the same truth. To hold that the Roman Catholic is the only true Church is not the same thing as to hold that Catholics, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists are all parts of the true Church. We shall make no worth-while progress in interreligious co-operation by pretending that such differences as these, and others, are either unreal or unimportant.

Indeed, the kind of wishy-washy indifference, bereft of any positive convictions, which often passes as tolerance, may be quite as hurtful as

intolerance itself. What tolerance, in any significant sense of the word, involves is not a spineless neutrality but my recognition of the other man's right to do his own honest thinking as I do mine and my readiness to respect his integrity even if his conclusions are different from mine. It means that I have so much confidence in the truth that I can trust it to win its way if only there is (a) a free atmosphere of sincere devotion to the truth and (b) a real desire to understand and work with one's fellow men at all points where agreement is found. Both of these two conditions are essential. As Phillips Brooks once said, zealous love of truth without love of man may produce a bigot, and zealous love of man without love of truth may produce a sentimentalist, but love of truth combined with love of man produces the truly tolerant spirit.

Our path of progress, therefore, is along a very different line than getting Catholics, Protestants, and Jews together for amiable conferences which studiously ignore any reference to the things which really make them Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. We must get over the spiritual laziness that makes us avoid a frank facing of our differences. We must not expect any group to give up any part of a vital and meaningful faith unless and until it finds a deeper faith. Into any co-operative process Protestants should bring their full inheritance of insight and conviction, at the same time committing themselves to a patient effort to understand the insights and convictions of the others.

In such processes controversies will, of course, arise. But there is no reason why Jews and Christians, Roman Catholics and Protestants, should shy away from the controversial aspects of their relationships, provided they are really trying to understand each other and not merely to score debating points against each other. So long as there are substantial differences of conviction, open controversy is usually more wholesome than a nervous attempt to keep them under cover. The desire to avoid controversy in matters of great consequence may even be a form of spiritual anemia. In any case, a hush-hush policy can accomplish nothing of value for anybody.

So the question is not whether there is to be controversy but in what spirit the controversy is to be carried on. A controversy need not mean an angry disputation. One of the dictionary definitions of the word is simply "a question to be settled." Of course, it is not easy to conduct a discussion in a dispassionate manner when strong convictions, and therefore emotions, are involved. Whether it can be done depends chiefly upon the measure of agreement which the parties recognize themselves

as holding in an area which lies deeper than the particular points of difference.

Now Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, in spite of their many differences, do have a large common inheritance. All three stand in reverence before the righteous and holy God. All three take the Ten Commandments as the starting point of their moral standards. All three find in the Psalms a priceless treasury of devotion. All three derive unfailing guidance from the ethical and spiritual insights of Amos, Hosea, Jeremiah, Isaiah, and Micah. Here is a tremendous area in which Jews, Protestants, and Catholics meet not as competitors but as comrades. They are on the same side of the line as over against the multitude of those who have no faith in a Divine Purpose and to whom the revelation in the Bible has no decisive significance.

Great differences, of course, remain. Between Jew and Christian there is the central issue as to who Jesus was and what he means to the world. Between Catholic and Protestant there is a radical difference in their conceptions of the nature and order of the Church. But if Jews and Christians, Catholics and Protestants, remember that these differences, great as they are, are overshadowed by still greater unities, they will be able to discuss their differences on a high level of mutual consideration and respect. And they will not allow the fact of difference in certain matters to stand in the way of their co-operation in other matters in which a substantial agreement really does exist.

Some of the differences between us are not matters of faith but are of a more practical character. On the part of Jew and Christian, for example, there are different approaches to the question of released time from the public school for religious education. Between Roman Catholic and Protestant, questions involving the relation of church and state—such as the use of public funds for sectarian schools and diplomatic representation at the Holy See—bristle with difficulties. So far as one can see there is at the moment no easy way of solving even these practical problems. All the parties concerned must appeal to the court of public opinion by which the decision—in so far as the community or the government is involved—must be made. But cannot each group state its case positively and constructively, without resorting to name-calling and the use of such gratuitous epithets as “fascist” or “bigot”? There is such a thing as fascism, but it is not fascism for American Catholics to believe that the Church should have an authoritarian administration under a hierarchy. There is such a thing as bigotry, but it is not bigotry for

American Protestants to hold that public funds shall be used only for public schools.

III

As for the more fundamental differences between us, those having to do with our spiritual insights and theological convictions, let me give three concrete illustrations, all drawn from recent experience, which seem to me to indicate the pathway along which progress in understanding and co-operation can be made.

The first illustration has to do with Jew and Christian. In a certain New England city the Council of Church Women, made up of Protestants of various denominations, wanted to do something to improve relations with the Jews. They decided to broaden the base of their organization so as to admit Jewish women to membership. The result is that the more distinctively religious aspects of their fellowship have been so watered down as to be no longer recognizable. Even public prayer has become a problem, lest Christian patterns of prayer should seem to show lack of consideration for the Jews. The group of women has become so inclusive that it is now hardly more than a civic organization trying to do useful things for the community. On the other hand, another Council of Church Women recently faced the same question of relationship with their Jewish neighbors and solved it in a different and far more promising way. The Council decided that the most important thing was to know more about the Jews, not merely as citizens, but as people of a great religious devotion. So a plan was developed by which the Christian women, as Christians, were invited to meet with the Temple Sisterhood. The Jewish women were proud to interpret their religious history and the genius of their Jewish worship. A little later the Temple Sisterhood was received by the Christian Council, and the life and work and worship of a Christian church were explained. This has led to a continuation of reciprocal courtesies, each group maintaining its own distinctive quality without adulteration, but at the same time coming to a much deeper knowledge and appreciation of the other.

A second illustration has to do with the relation of Protestant and Eastern Orthodox. Twenty-five years ago they were almost entirely out of touch with each other. Today several of the branches of the Eastern Orthodox share in the fellowship both of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the World Council of Churches. What has brought about the new situation in so short a time? Chiefly the simple desire to understand each other better, which led, hesitantly

at first, to their sharing in important studies in which they had a common concern. Meeting together in various conferences, exchanging views and experiences without any attempt of either to impose its own position on the other, they have come to know each other well enough to discover a steadily widening area of co-operative activity. A generation ago they emphasized differences so much that agreements were wholly obscured. Today they see their differences, which of course remain, in the light of their agreements.

The third illustration has to do with Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Eastern Orthodox in the realm of attitude toward each other. A convocation of Protestant ministers used the following litany in its "ecumenical service of worship":

Let us give thanks for the gifts and graces of each great division of Christendom:

For the Roman Catholic Church; its glorious traditions, its disciplines in holiness, its worship, rich with the religious passion of the centuries; its noble company of martyrs, doctors and saints.

For the Eastern Orthodox Church; its secret treasure of mystic experience; its marvelous liturgy; its regard to the collective life and the common will as a source of authority.

For the great Protestant Communions:

For the Congregationalist concern for the rightful independence of the soul and of the group.

For the stress in the Baptist churches upon personal regeneration and upon the conscious relation of the mature soul to its Lord.

For the power of the Methodists to awaken the conscience of Christians to social evils; and for their emphasis upon the witness of personal experience, and upon the power of the disciplined life.

For the Presbyterians' reverence for the sovereignty of God, and their confidence in his faithfulness to his covenant; for their sense of the moral law, expressing itself in constitutional government.

For the witness of the perpetual real Presence of the inner light in every human soul borne by the Religious Society of Friends, and for their faithful continuance of a free prophetic ministry.

For the Lutheran Church; its devotion to the Grace of God and the Word of God, enshrined in the ministry of the Word and sacraments.

For the Anglican Church; its reverent and temperate ways, through its Catholic heritage and its Protestant conscience; its yearning concern over the divisions of Christendom, and its longing to be used as a house of reconciliation.

After each of these designations by the leader the congregation responded:

We thank thee, Lord, and bless thy holy name.

There are doubtless descriptions in this litany which are inadequate and there are omissions which may be filled in, but it indicates the quality of spirit and outlook which is the primary requirement for greater co-

operation. At least it suggests that progress in working together depends, first, on each group's developing its own distinctive genius to the highest level of its capacity, and, second, on each group's learning to appreciate the precious insights for which the others stand. It may also turn out that under the guidance of the Holy Spirit the various groups will find that some of the things which have constituted their own historic witness have come to be accepted by other groups, and that a greater synthesis will one day be possible than any of them can now imagine.

If we develop this desire and capacity for mutual understanding, we may at least expect that we shall find widening areas of co-operation. There will, of course, be limits beyond which some groups, particularly the Roman Catholic, cannot go, so long as their dogmatic position continues unchanged. To recognize these existing limits and to keep within them may be a necessary condition of co-operation in those other areas in which there are no insuperable obstacles.

The co-operation that is thus possible is of different types. At the simplest and most frequent level it consists of working together as individuals in matters of civic and social concern in which there is a clear common interest. The raising of community welfare funds is a common illustration.

A higher level of co-operation is reached when religious leaders, even though not acting with ecclesiastical authorization, unite on some common platform. Perhaps the best instance of this was "Pattern for Peace," a joint statement on the moral and spiritual foundations for international order, issued by a hundred of the highest officials of Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism during the war.

A still higher level is attained when religious agencies more or less closely related to the churches effect plans for continuous co-operation in various forms of social work. The way in which the Y.M.C.A., the National Catholic Community Service, the Jewish Welfare Board, and other bodies worked together in the U.S.O. during the whole period of the war is a conspicuous example.

At the highest level we come, at least occasionally, to the official co-operation of the religious bodies themselves. It is illustrated by certain studies in the social-economic field which the Federal Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis have made, notably the joint declaration on the twelve-hour day in the steel industry in 1923.

The illustrations of such united ecclesiastical action as the latter are

rather few, but there are more frequent instances of what may be called parallel action—i.e., action taken by each of the three groups on its own separate responsibility but after consultation with one another and along lines which move toward the same goal. The vigorous programs carried on by the national organizations of Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews in behalf of the displaced persons of Europe are a heartening illustration.

How one wishes that such examples as these of various types described not the occasional but the normal practice! In his biography of Benjamin Franklin, Carl Van Doren recalls an old newspaper account of the parade celebrating Independence Day when the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia in 1787. It was the first time, the account says, when the city had seen "the clergy of different Christian denominations, with the rabbi of the Jews, walking arm in arm." May the ancient scene become a symbol of the religious spirit in American life!

Present Trends in Protestant Thought

NELS F. S. FERRÉ

As the traditional basic tenets in Protestantism have been undermined, fundamentalism and liberalism as well as two important new European trends are seeking firmer foundations.

THE PRESENT TRENDS in Protestantism must be seen against the background of its long-range plight. Part of this plight comes from a general questioning, if not outright repudiation, of Western thought and culture, including Christianity. But much of it is due to two peculiar emphases within Protestantism which are now found wanting. They are biblicism and individualism.

For most of two thousand years the Christian faith lived rather innocently within the world view of the Bible, whether of the Old or the New Testament. For most of that time it was further secured by a doctrine of the Church as divine authority on earth. Protestantism however chose, generally speaking, to make the Bible its only authority. As a consequence, when its facts were challenged by science and when historical criticism undermined the authority of the Bible from within, Protestantism was caught without any adequate objective authority. The Roman Catholic Church, and to some extent the creedal churches within Protestantism, had cities of refuge where they could cling to the horns of the altar, but biblical Protestantism found itself seeking steadiness and security almost in vain. While this situation was understood by only a few leading thinkers, the problem was not crucial; when it became plain to the churches in general, however, it was almost shattering. Protestantism is now paying heavy toll for a narrow foundation, which is being toppled increasingly in spite of all the shoulders that are trying to steady it.

Faith cannot be strong unless it can almost be taken for granted. Yet with the foundation undermined something had to be done, and resort was consequently made to reasoned experience to secure the Christian foundation of life. Thus metaphysics, value theory, history, and individual experience were brought in to cement the cracks in the biblical foundation. But neither philosophy nor personal experience could successfully withstand the beating floods of scientism, relativism, historicism, and psychologism on the one hand and the dark depths of Marxianism and Freudianism on the other. Newton, Darwin, Marx, and Freud cap-

tured, directly or indirectly, one field of thought after another. Either mechanism and determinism held sway or else they were conquered by the newer developments, not for a free faith but for skepticism!

Protestantism was especially vulnerable because it had emphasized the free individual before God. This emphasis was encouraged, and later taken advantage of, by the secular forces in economic and political life, which also stressed the supremacy of the individual and kept pounding home his rights over against society. Protestantism by its individualism both became weakeningly embroiled with the secular world if not nearly absorbed by it, and lost the steadiness and the security of a strong Church as the unifying and interpretative organ of the Christian faith. Its stress on freedom was far more the immature cry for individuation than a mature concern for fullness of fellowship. With the Bible taken for granted as the truth, individualism, even though divisive, could exist within a general authority broader than any individual or group opinion. But this objectively unifying factor was gradually recognized as factually fallacious, both from secularly established facts and by means of criticism from within. Thus commenced the collapse of Protestantism as naïve biblicism, and with it also its former chance for almost uncurbed individualism. The creedal churches were only temporarily better off, since they did not have to face the flood directly; but sooner or later they, too, came to feel the impact; and even the Roman Catholic Church had to contend with modernism. Great masses, even of church people, came to accept in the depth of their hearts the world view of the secularized sciences rather than the former supernaturalistic Christian faith. No sketch of the present trends in Protestantism can be right which does not do justice to the long-range crisis of biblicism and the insecurities of modern relativisms of whatever form.

I

Today both fundamentalism and liberalism are shatteringly hit by the historical method and historical events. By fundamentalism is meant the precritical acceptance of the total Bible as infallible revelation. By liberalism I mean the acceptance of man's common reasoned experience as the standard of ultimate truth.

Fundamentalism still has numerous adherents and shows signs of real activity. But its mood, whether evasively or aggressively, is more and more defensive. A book like *The Infallible Word* by the faculty of the Westminster Seminary, for instance, shows at the same time real

resources and the difficulty which fundamentalism has with the problem of biblical criticism and the scientific world view. On the social front, moreover, Karl Henry's *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, even by its title sufficiently indicates the situation, at least as far as the awakened and sensitive thinkers go. Those who contact the world in general, in any case, usually show heavy defensive strain; but most fundamentalists of course are simply ignorant of the nature and depth of the plight of Protestantism.

Fundamentalism, as the defender of supernaturalism, has nevertheless a genuine heritage and a profound truth to preserve. If I may predict, I think that we shall some day thank our fundamentalist friends for having held the main fortress while countless leaders went over to the foe of a limited scientism and a shallow naturalism. They have understood, whether consciously or not in all instances, that the revelation of the Most High cannot logically be proved by anything lower than itself; that some objectively steady strand of history, like the Bible, is necessary for faith to be free and strong; that no amount of historic approximation to the good (progress) can prove the ultimate; that the spiritual has its own being which cannot be reduced to pseudoscientific psychological tests. Men like Van Til, Henry, Ockenga, G. Wilbur Smith, and others, have much truth to tell. When fundamentalism dares to get out from under its burden of an impossible literalism, which it is beginning to do, and to face head-on the problems of science, insofar as it gives us genuine facts by means of a legitimate method, it can begin to contribute more to the making of the post-Protestant era of the Christian faith. Then it will also find more freedom and creative urgency for constructive social responsibility.

Liberalism is also on the defensive, apologetically or aggressively. Actually liberalism's understanding of "man's common reasoned experience" became mostly a matter of man's natural goodness, the naturalness of progress, love without austere judgment, and a rather tolerant individualism. Much of this is still held in modified forms in remaining liberal areas, but a good deal of it has been and is being increasingly swept away. Part of its decline, of course, is due to the expected swing of fashion. We superficial intellectuals are continually seeking something new. Philosophies, says Whitehead, are not so much refuted as passed by for something new. So are theologies! When *The Religious Liberals Reply* now, however, it is mostly in the tired voice of retired men, and sounds much like "we who are about to die salute you."

But the deeper reason for the repudiation of liberalism is history itself. It is hard to observe the amazing and widespread cruelties of our times and still believe that man is strongly bent toward the good of his fellow man. Depth psychology, too, has told us the same thing with a vengeance. Nor is it easy to ponder two universal conflagrations of hate and destruction and still believe in progress as the natural order of things. Even harder it is to stand on the verge of possible world destruction and lisp, "upward and onward forever." We have seen bestiality and progress in reverse to the point where liberalism has embarrassed the thoughtful.

Liberalism now maintains a good many of its followers simply because these cannot see any real hope in what to them are merely the counsels of despair of the neo-orthodox. Many are confused and wonder whether there is not some road to travel where truth will be consistent with our best thinking and where constructive directions will be offered for practical action. Fosdick is reported to have said that he has seen the sway of liberalism, has then seen its decline, and expects to see its return. My own feeling also is that liberalism has been more than mere *bourgeois* complacency, that liberalism *at heart* has in fact treasured truth and the hard, careful, co-operative way to it. It has been an expression of man's constructive faith and activity. All things can be abused, and liberalism is certainly not to be blamed for the generally unsatisfactory conditions which characterize all things human! The trouble with liberalism was rather that it became allied with an improperly reductionistic scientism and with philosophies that were too much centered in our present historic process rather than in God's eternal purpose. It was right in its essential affirmation that God is Creator and Lord of history, but wrong in its self-sufficient mood and failure to observe seriously enough man's actual sinfulness. Liberalism's stress on reason, experience, and love will nevertheless remain, however buried by moods, and will flower once more when a new and fuller faith gives these their fuller reality-content and truer context of meaning.

II

The modern world, however, is decreasingly concerned with either fundamentalism or liberalism. Both of these groups are either strident by-eddies or largely areas of inertia. Coming to the fore in present Protestant thought are two new trends: *Agape* theology and existentialism. The former goes back, of course, to New Testament times, when it was new yeast in vibrant lives; but for its first major and radical rejuvenation

since Luther we must go to the Swedish theologians at Lund, particularly Gustaf Aulén and Anders Nygren.

Agape means simply the New Testament kind of love enacted in Jesus Christ; that is, God's love for sinful man, through which alone man can find a right relation with God in faith and forgiveness and a right relation with his fellow man in the power of God's love. The Swedish theology relates itself to modern knowledge mostly by cutting itself off from it. The approach (at least in its beginnings) was through an adaptation of the Kantian method, according to which religion becomes a necessary and independent form of experience but unknowable by reason, which is limited strictly to formal or factual judgments. Religion is, rather, a necessary value judgment concerning the ultimate—unprovable, but also undefeatable, by reason. The nature of religion can be determined only as actual religions are analyzed to find its very heart, its basic "motif." The heart of Christianity definitively described is *Agape*, the redemptive love of God in Christ Jesus. This *Agape* must be the free gift of God through faith in Christ. Man in himself, however, is universally driven by *Eros*, a desiring, self-seeking love.

No one can be well acquainted with the Protestant thought of the world without knowing how this *Agape* theology has spread and worked in our generation. The rediscovery has been theological dynamite. Men like Brunner and Reinhold Niebuhr have been especially influenced by it; but a survey of thought in Asia, Europe, and the United States would find how continually this *Agape* is referred to in contrast to *Eros*. Some of the deepest wrestlers with it are also within the Roman Catholic and the Anglican communions, men like D'Arcy and Burnaby. A most important translation movement is now under way which will bring an impressive number of significant recent Swedish books into English; and the Westminster Press is bringing out besides a nearly definitive book on Swedish theology: Edgar Carlson's *The Reinterpretation of Luther*. Since the movement is young, its first task has been to know its central affirmations. Its present energy is consequently being spent in producing biblical commentaries as the foundation of a biblical theology to supplement its previous biblical, historical, and systematic works.

This tide is definitely rising in influence. What shall we say of it? Since I am myself often placed within this group, believing as I do in the centrality of *Agape* for Christian faith, it is perhaps hard for me to judge. The point of view has produced a New Testament and a historical theology in works of varying significance, the greatest of which

is Nygren's *Agape and Eros*. Aulén's systematic theology is soon to be published in this country, with undoubted effect. In its basic affirmations this theology is surely right. As far as method goes, the ultimate cannot be proved by anything less than itself, nor can religion be reduced to dependence upon proofs in terms of other categories of experience. The life of faith is inevitably primary. When our little ideas of Reality become the objects of faith, we have but poverty; and when our goodness is considered ultimate, we have but "filthy rags of righteousness." Faith to be strong must ever soar creatively beyond our best ideas to correct and to complete them, and beyond our best conduct to judge and to fulfill it. Then, too, as far as theological content goes, *Agape* is surely the central reality of the Christian faith; freedom and faithfulness in fellowship, through faith in God as disclosed at his highest in the *Agape*-teaching and enactment in Jesus, are the seal and sign of the Christian faith. When God's *Agape* in Christ becomes our primary faith-judgment, Christian faith cannot be reduced to any philosophy nor can its life be pressed down into any prescribed moralism.

Yet even though these two truths are basic, I feel, nevertheless, that they need supplementation. Though faith cannot be *proved* by thought and life, it should be vitally *confirmed* by both. The secondary task is always to relate this primary truth to truth in general, whether in education or in civilization. God is above, over and in all, and his truth is therefore organically related to all there is, whether directly or indirectly, whether in judgment or in completion. We need, therefore, to relate the Christian faith to the total process of which God is Creator, in all realms of thought, and in all aspects of life. My feeling is that Swedish theology has so far failed in this secondary task, though a significant book like Aulén's *Church, Law and Society* (Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1948) will do something to fill in the gap.

The strongest present tendency of Protestantism is existentialism. The men who today command the greatest attention are thinkers like Kierkegaard, Barth, Brunner, Niebuhr, and Tillich. Perhaps a better general term would be "neo-orthodoxy," but no term does justice to the several points of view. By existentialism I here mean the primary stress on the decision of the individual regarding eternity, on man's believing and thinking within his inescapable encounter with the all-demanding God of the Bible. These thinkers are united against fundamentalism in rejecting both biblical literalism and Christian doctrines as objectively adequate transcriptions of eternal truths or events. They are united,

in general, against liberalism in their rejection of man's reason as valid in the realm of religion, accepting instead a dynamic biblical revelation; they reject also man's basic goodness, and human experience as a method for finding Christian truth or as the ground for any assurance of salvation.

Generally they accept biblical criticism, sometimes of a radical type, but maintain a biblical realism in which the Bible as a self-interpretative whole-pattern constitutes the authority of the Word of God, if it is also interpreted by the Spirit in the mood of confession and witness. Some call this a sophisticated fundamentalism; others, "the new modernism," because of its dependence on Kant's critical philosophy. There is a good deal of truth in both charges, but this school of modern existentialists simply attempts to maintain the center of the Christian tradition at a time when it has been undermined not only by biblical criticism and individualism, but by hostile thought-patterns in the secular world of thought. This tendency is definitely on the increase especially among the younger thinkers, but is being somewhat checked among the most thoughtful by serious searchings as to "where to go from here" constructively.

Without a doubt the influence of Kierkegaard, a Danish thinker who lived a century ago, has been the living fountainhead of this movement. The other large source of inspiration is Reformation theology. Kierkegaard revolted against Hegel's smooth pan-logical system. Instead of putting emphasis on ideas and on the whole of reality, he stressed the bankruptcy of reason in the field of religion and the primacy of the individual. Instead of the common obeisance to objectivity and disinterestedness, he came out flat-footedly for subjectivity and passionate personal decision. Instead of dwelling on eternity's solution of history's problems, he insisted that man had to confront eternal decisions in history, where reigned dark death and fateful risk. Eternity and time he held to be infinitely different *qualitatively*. In a world of complacent Christianity he believed that the most difficult thing possible was to become "a New Testament Christian." Instead of buttressing our faith with theological systems, historical approximations, or ethical applicabilities, he believed that we must accept Christ as though contemporaneous with him in his humility, in his incognito, accepting the shame, the offense.

To be a Christian meant to him to suffer dialectically in the passionate, personal appropriation of the absurd, namely that God became man, eternity entered time. This was the supreme paradox of Chris-

tian faith. Beyond this deep despair of man, however, as he faced the *depth-anxiety* of decision for eternity, lay the salvation of total surrender to God in Christ and the peace that passeth understanding. Beyond the stage of "the knight of infinite resignation" lay the final stage of "the knight of faith."

Kierkegaard showed himself one of the greatest thinkers of the modern world in his aesthetic, ethical, philosophical, and religious writings. He was also an artist in the method of communication, and even an exceptional writer of great literature. In this country Kierkegaard has only recently been discovered, because only within the last few years has the bulk of his works been translated into English by diligent workers like Professor and Mrs. David Swenson, Walter Lowrie, and Douglas Steere. The influence which Kierkegaard has had on all the existential thinkers is actually enormous. Through Barth especially he has also influenced New Testament scholarship, and now we have an exceptionally able presentation of a Kierkegaardian rendering of New Testament theology in Paul Minear's *Eyes of Faith*.

III

Karl Barth is the most influential among modern theologians. He is a Swiss theologian who has also taught for many years and in different places in Germany. If he finishes his proposed *Church Dogmatics*, it has been said that he will have written four million words, the most of any theologian in the history of the world! Though of a conservative background, Barth spent his early life as a devoted disciple of Ritschl and Herrmann, and even yet much of their teachings keeps cropping out, though with a new flavor. After the first World War, however, the liberal Barth became the flaming prophet and burning preacher of a God-centered Christianity. His first period of reaction against liberalism, symbolized by his *Epistle to the Romans*, especially by the second edition, was as austere transcendent in its dualism between time and eternity as any (or more than any) in the history of Christian thought. Revelation was not at all involved with any question of human reason; Jesus as God was not at all in time, only tangent to it; God was not at all in history, in nature, in man; man's decision in his "sickness unto death" was totally God's work; theology was entirely a matter of eschatology, the vertically direct Word of God to man, entirely and nothing else; there could be no knowledge of God in experience, and no assurance of salvation in any form; salvation was only a matter of pure hope in fear

and trembling; God's inscrutable election for eternal life or damnation alone counted.

From 1925 to 1927, and on to 1932, with the publication of *Christian Dogmatics* and then *Church Dogmatics*, as the second edition significantly was called, Barth relaxed from his extreme "theology of crisis" into a more constructive "theology of the Word." The main emphases are still there, but Barth has become aware of his former non-Christian philosophical orientation; and forsaking this Kierkegaardian legacy which formed the heart of his *Epistle to the Romans*, he now labors to free theology from philosophy entirely. He wants theology to be the work of the Church from the pure perspective of the Bible itself. Jesus now becomes truly incarnate in time, and, in general, the broad directives of traditional Christian faith become more operative.

The two remaining periods we can only mention; they overlap one another to a point where lines are hard to draw. Barth was one of the most valiant fighters of Hitlerism in Europe. Barth's social teachings, because of his depth-understanding of our human problems, have been enormously powerful in killing the more optimistic "social gospel" in one circle after another. This third aspect (if not properly "period") of his teaching is characterized by a fight for the right to preach the gospel and an opposition to totalitarianism not on the basis of human rights, natural law, democracy, or any such human motive or standard, but for the sake of our allegiance to the risen Christ. His net effect in this field has been to fortify and strengthen Christian self-consciousness and courage. But instead of making the salt have its saltiness in the world which needs it, much of his effect has unfortunately been to pull the salt out of the meat and put it in a separate barrel lest the meat spoil it.

In his latest period, particularly with the writing of Volume II, Part II, and Volume III, Part I of his *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, Barth has relaxed into a true "knight of faith." The gospel is no longer dialectical at its innermost center; all of creation and history are in God's care and keeping, the Christian must exhibit the joy of trust in God's never-failing love, no rejection of any sinner by God is unconditional. Barth has been lifted into "the joy and peace of believing" and is singing a new song, even the triumphant song of the Lamb. Barth's pilgrimage has been from a secularized liberalism, through revulsion from it to a doctrine of complete Divine transcendence, then through constructive theological thinking, to a quiet trusting and interpreting of God's way to man, illumined by the vision of his Face. He has gone through the stages of

speculative thinker, fiery prophet, and professor, and has become a radiant, increasingly reliable Christian seer. The latest development is his passionate acceptance, in *Christengemeinde und Bürgergemeinde*, of the responsibility of general civil life as inseparably a part of Christian faith (this is accepted also by much of the Confessional Church). He even calls the State the earthly analogy of the Kingdom of God. Barth is swinging into a genuinely positive, constructive task.

Much could be said of Brunner, another Swiss theologian who has produced many highly significant volumes on the great themes of the Christian faith. He began as a disciple of Barth and has passed through several stages of development, including the Oxford Group period, which did much to give a certain evangelical flavor to his thought. For many years he was my favorite theologian and he would be hard to replace even now—though Barth's latest period seems to me richer than Brunner's, who sometimes seems on the verge of becoming a nonliteralistic fundamentalist. Brunner differs from Barth mostly in his finding more room for the image of God in man, at least formally in terms of man's universal answerability to the Word; in his finding more room for reason, not as a substitute or an autonomous aid to revelation in any way, but as the means of a vigorous Christian apologetic and the relating of the Christian truth to modern knowledge; in his finding more room, if not for natural theology in the old sense, at least for general revelation, which can be adequately understood only in the light of God's redemptive revelation in Christ; and in his finding a real centrality for *Agape*, especially and increasingly during the last few years. It must be said, of course, that Barth himself has in his latest period come to understand and accept more of God's love, but not in the uncompromising, outspoken way of Brunner. Brunner insists that the whole Bible is only a commentary on the one word and that all theology is but an exposition of it. Brunner has greater works on social ethics than Barth, books like *The Divine Imperative* and *Justice and the Social Order*, and rather naturally also on the doctrine of man, like the immensely important work, *Man in Revolt*. Brunner's style and thought are, besides, more congenial to the English-speaking world; he is consequently far better known in actual reading than Barth; he has also taught in this country (Princeton) and lectured here extensively.

There is little need for us to discuss Reinhold Niebuhr. He is a prophetic speaker and writer of unique stature in this country and, for that matter, is almost as well known throughout the world. Perhaps

his biggest contribution, personally and through his disciples, is the popularizing of this existential trend. He has been exceptionally alert to all the deeper currents and knew something of Swedish theology, Kierkegaard, and Barth, while to many other thinkers in this country they were merely names. He has also helped to make widely known the thinking of Paul Tillich. His Gifford Lectures, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, show genuine synthetic theological powers; but his real forte is, of course, in the realm of social action. There his ability to keep the full Christian gospel and norm distinct from the actual ways of the world, and yet to insist on the practicality of action within those ways of the world, is exceptional. He has, too, a genuine Augustinian stress on humility in all spheres of life which carries weight with different circles of thinkers, many of whom are not touched by other Protestant thought. Niebuhr has an openness of spirit combined with positive convictions that is worth much to his colleagues and followers. His total influence is catapulting, though some are now beginning to ask him for more constructive directives in theological thought.

We mention Paul Tillich last because, in some respects, he may have more lasting influence than any of the others. Tillich is a German refugee now teaching at Union Theological Seminary, New York, who is greatly respected by those who know him. Unfortunately he has not been widely enough known. He is best known for two books, *The Religious Situation* and *The Interpretation of History*, and for some chapters contributed to symposiums. Soon, however, two other books by him are to appear: *The Protestant Era* and *The Shaking of the Foundations*. Besides this, The Library of Living Theology plans to come out with a volume on him as the first of its series, which will also acquaint the general reader with the contents of some of his untranslated German works. Tillich is a "borderline" theologian between the sacred and the secular, between the theological and the philosophical, between the rational and the existential, and between the theological and the social. Few thinkers go so deeply into the understanding of both theological and modern political and social problems while also participating actively in political and social movements. The three most permanent areas of his contribution may be the relation of the existential to the rational perspectives; the depth-dimension in terms of which to understand man and history, including the nature of time and evil; and the particular need of our day for a religious socialism which will both criticize modern capitalism and yet not succumb to the false pretensions of any secularized

form of socialism. He forms a bridge between supernaturalism and naturalism, being neither in traditional terms; and between existentialism and liberalism, holding, in fact, that "neo-orthodoxy" is but a footnote to liberalism. Though there is no place here to expound his complex and subtle thinking, it is well to watch him increasingly because of his depth, comprehensiveness, understanding of history, thorough modernity, and all this with an unusual critically constructive and creative spirit.

IV

General conclusions as to the major trends of Protestant thought are difficult, but we must make them. (1) Literalistic fundamentalism is strongly on the decline and is therefore defensive, whether evasively or aggressively, and yet also looking for a constructive way out while rightly cherishing its deepest inner truth. (2) Yesterday's liberalism is also on the wane, but it cannot easily be surrendered until its insistence on intellectual honesty is adequately met; until, that is, Christian truth is seen in relation to, and confirmed by, truth in general. I think that a new analysis of faith and reason, eternity and history, and other relevant problems, will soon make this possible. (3) Swedish theology will shortly be far better known here and will loom up as strong along several lines, but the main contribution it seems likely to make is the clarification of the meaning and centrality of *Agape* for Christian faith. (4) Existentialism, or neo-orthodoxy, is strong in its central affirmations: theocentricity, the centrality of Christ for Christian faith, the stress on revelation as authority, and its mood of faith. But, except for some borderline work, it has lived mostly in a negative relation to all other provinces of thought and life, education, and civilization. I think that in general we must accept its affirmations and deny its negations. For the latter we must substitute constructive work to integrate our seeing into whole-vision for the sake of a confused and shattered world.

It seems likely that we may be in for dangerous drives toward a narrow biblicism. In days of stress the Bible seems the most available external authority, but *no theology that denies a free, open, and all-inclusive method can be lastingly adequate*. The centrality of faith must not mean the murdering of reason. Such an assassination will be eventually revenged by an ineffectual intellectualism. We need both to keep faith central and yet to give reason its proper place as faith's check and challenge, confirming its conclusions when both faith and reason are right. The main question is: where do we go constructively from here? If

that question is answered aright in faith, devotion, life, thought, and urgent social application, we should expect one of the most creative theological eras of human history. Many signs already point that way, if our faith first be effective enough for history to remain.

In nearly all the trends we have considered there is a new appreciation of the doctrine of the Church. As biblical literalism becomes less and less possible, it seems likely that fundamentalism will either fall back on a rigid creedalism or advance into a dynamic concept of the Church as an organ of revelation and custodian of truth. As liberalism finds its too narrow view of reason undependable and failing in power, it, too, should turn to the dynamic organ of truth which is the Christian fellowship. But this Church or fellowship will offer no solution unless it be the historic enactment of the faith, freedom, and fellowship of God's love as conclusively exhibited in Jesus' life, death, teachings, and resurrection. Yet again this love, as enacted in Jesus and continuously exhibited more or less clearly in the fellowship, becomes distorted and unavailable except in the existential decision of the individual before God. That is where faith's fellowship is generated. All Christian affirmations become wooden and foreign unless they are received as living truth by, in, and for the fellowship, even as they moment by moment live unto God and for the world.

Thus there can be worked out a fuller faith, including fundamentalism's stress on the supernatural, liberalism's stress on truth, the *Agape*-centrality of the Swedish school, and the dynamic faith of the existentialists. Protestantism is ready for a new day of creative, constructive faith—if we let God work in us the light and the power for that day.

Families Should Worship Together

LOUISE PARKS WINFIELD

The need for a family-focused religion and restoration of the family pew—children require not only each other but association with their elders in the church.

HOW MANY CHILDREN were there in the congregation the last time you went to church? Many of the churches we have attended lately have had so few children present at a regular worship service that our three youngsters have been conspicuous among the adults. One summer morning we went into the side entrance of a New York Fifth Avenue church and ran into the sexton, who took one look at us and threw up his hands in unrestrained alarm.

"The children, the children," he said, "but I am sure we have no provision for the children during the summer months. Shall I . . . ? Shall I . . . ?"

Poor man, I guess he thought we would expect him to mind the young ones while we went to church. We relieved him considerably when we told him that the children were going to church with us. I do believe he was shocked at that prospect as well, because as we went out to find the main entrance he was saying:

"Are you quite sure they will be all right?"

At another New York church our arrival prompted one usher to call a member of the ministerial staff, and he advised us to sit in a little side room where we could hear but the children could be free to move around and "amuse" themselves. Obviously, at neither of these churches is it the established practice for families *with their children* to be regular and participating members of the congregation. More children are seen in smaller community churches. Even there, are we not all familiar with the traffic jam that occurs when children bolt out of Sunday school to join parents waiting in cars or, if they are older, to go home alone to read the funnies?

If, as I am inclined to suspect, it is ceasing to be a deep-seated American tradition that families go together to the church of their choice to worship together according to the pattern of worship most truly satisfying to them, then I fear something very special is going to be lost from our American way of life. Unless families today can see the need of

joining *as families* in services of spiritual awareness and dedication, and unless church leaders can see the importance of family-focused religion, I have serious doubts as to the ability of our society to achieve the moral stamina which secular and spiritual spokesmen alike insist we must have if we are to cope with an atomic revolution.

Naturally, I am not talking about intelligent people taking their children to churches that are out of step with our age. I believe there are scores of spiritually mature ministers, priests, and rabbis in American churches, cathedrals, and synagogues today who have a comprehensive understanding of the world in which we live and a sincere desire to lead their people into a growing discovery of spiritual values and resources sufficient for even such days as these. These men make their contributions at many points in the lives of individuals and communities, but they make them most significantly, I think, when they stand in their pulpits on the Sabbath morning and lead congregations in experiences of worship that reaffirm their faith in high values and reinforce their commitment to far-flung goals.

The best religion has always been a community affair, and the priests and prophets among us simply cannot have the influence they ought to have in society unless they affect family groups who in turn will make an impact on cross-section social living during this generation and the next. The religious reconversion that is crying out to be released in our world demands more than the strength of one individual communicant here and one middle-aged couple there. If the superficialities and fears and self-centered procedures of materialistic confusion are to be pushed away, it is imperative that there be a mobilization of whole families who are concerned about the Community of Man—whole families with individuals of every age making their special contributions. The weekly worship service of a church or synagogue could become the spiritual briefing at which regularly the whole family is given its bearings for daily living.

From Grandfather to little Laura the family needs the kind of direction which a consecrated clergyman can help them find and the kind of spiritual refreshment and unity that is created when a group of people reach out together toward the infinite. It is good for the youngsters to see old Mrs. Tracy, who has demonstrated kindness and righteousness in the community for almost a century, slip into her pew and adjust her hearing aid. It is heart-warming for Mrs. Tracy to see little Tom between big Tom and Helen. It is good for teenster John to see his

father ushering people into a church that stands for moral purposes. It is good for clothes-conscious Sally to have an opportunity to lay a contribution on the offering plate each week and to know where and how the money will be used to raise the level of life for other people. It is good for a woman to have her husband and their children quietly near her as she listens to the minister interpret values which she very much wants to implant in their home. It is good for a man to take time out from the bustle of business and think about the kind of world he wants to help create for the children who sit beside him. It is good for a little child to hear the swelling music of an organ, to see light play on stained windows, to nestle in the warmth and security of a grandmother's lap. It is a *good* experience for families to worship together and I just can't understand why more of them don't do it.

I could not think it good enough for our family if on this special day of the week John went his way with a golf club, Sally went her way with a stack of comics, Bob went his way on a bicycle, and I went my own way to shampoo my hair and perhaps to hear good music on the radio. None of this would I label as "wrong" activity for Sunday. We don't any of us have enough time just to fool around and relax ourselves. I should never insist that we spend the whole day going to church. There are other kinds of family activity like picnics in the country, walks by the Hudson, visits to other families, or cocoa and popcorn by the firelight, which add special enrichment to our Sundays. But nothing else we do together is quite the same as or an adequate substitute for our worshiping as a family in the church we have chosen as our own. It does a good deal to help us as a family keep oriented in the world of values. It gives us an opportunity to quiet ourselves and rest together after the fatigue of our separate activities. *Not* incidentally, family church attendance is one of the best ways I know for a family to have its sense of being a family strengthened. From the point of view of personality well-being, is there anything more needed today than the security that individuals have when they know themselves to be parts of a spiritually unified family group?

Just as I consider it not good enough for us all to go our separate ways outside the church on Sunday morning (or Friday evening or whenever the church group to which we belong holds its regular worship service), neither do I consider it good enough for my husband and me to go to church alone while our nine- and eleven-year-olds are kept busy in a church-school "department" that plans a three-hour program

for them and while our four-year-old spends the same three hours in her overalls in the nursery-school section of the church climbing jungle-gyms, struggling over possession of toys, doing exactly the kind of things nursery children in that church do all week. It isn't good enough for the children to join us for worship in the main auditorium of a church just once a year when it is Church School Day.

I have respect for the good intentions of religious education workers who plan these separate sessions for children. They know well how in the not too distant past, children as children were neglected in the church as well as in their homes and schools. They were either babied and indulged on the one hand or held up to a too strict adult standard on the other hand. They were not accepted as growing persons. In the church they sometimes sat through long sessions and became weary and indifferent. Or sometimes tremendous emotional pressure was put on them and they entered conversion orgies that may have been upsetting as often as they were orienting. In contrast, the modern church school with trained and sympathetic leadership, with programs growing out of the interests and age levels of the children is a blessing for which parents and children alike have cause to be grateful. But the blessing is not without blemish to my way of thinking because in an increasing number of churches, instead of stepping in and making the traditional Sunday school a more valuable and satisfying experience for children, the church school has become church itself for all the children under high-school age. Granted the children like it (though our children did not like the idea of the three-hour session which they said would make Sunday just like any school day), granted the children grow in its friendly atmosphere, granted the minister may preach better without the interruption of some child's outcry, granted Mother may meditate better without a youngster emptying the contents of her purse on the church pew. Granted all this and more, I still contend that it is not necessary or valuable that we separate "according to age" when the hour for worship arrives.

Psychologists have yet to prove that even the old-fashioned church, shortcomings notwithstanding, did more harm than good to the children who attended. A person of the "separatist school" who tried recently to convince me that it is better for young children not to be taken to church, admitted that she was taken to church as a child and considers herself none the worse for it. When I told a church-school director that I would rather have our children go to the church worship service

with us than to have them join the church-school session that would keep them out of that worship service, his eyebrow-lifted comment was:

"But the church service is so adult."

That is the most fallacious argument I have heard in a long time. It seems to me that a person is pathetically unaware of the true range of a child's understanding if he considers that nine-year-olds and eleven-year-olds would find a really good church service too adult. Children who at school have learned to know and love the masters—who play in orchestras and attend concerts; would they find the delicate harmony of church hymns too adult, or the organ preludes and the anthems of the choir? Would all this soar above the ears of modern youngsters? Would children who write poetry and produce plays be unable to read and appreciate the scriptural responses at church? Would children who discuss news headlines the first thing at school every morning be too little to listen as the minister earnestly prays:

. . . . bless thy servant the President of the United States, and all others in authority; and so replenish them with the grace of thy Holy Spirit, that they may always incline to thy will, and walk in thy way.

Would children who are learning from infancy the language of science be too young to begin learning the language of religion? Would children who participate in family finance discussions be too young to lay a portion of the family income on the church offering plate? Have we in the religious-education field become so afraid of emotion that we think it would somehow not be good for children to be inspired by the minister's stories of modern disciples who brave racial or national frontiers to carry a message of redemptive love? Are we so tied up in our own theological tangles that we do not realize that the great sermons which are being preached in many churches today—and which ought to be preached in all churches—are profound in their brevity and simplicity? Do we not know that eleven-year-olds and nine-year-olds and even four-year-olds are capable of a great deal more profundity than they are generally given credit for? Of course, the children are not going to follow every sermon in its outline (honest now, do you?). Much of it will be out of the range of their experience, but not all of it. Some illustration, some definition, some question may penetrate the conscious or subconscious mind of the child, and he will be a better person because of that penetration.

It is a modern heresy, I guess, for me to say that the child who goes to church is getting the habit of church attendance. Some leaning-

over-backwards liberals I know would theoretically condemn the whole idea of habit formation and specifically decry the justification of church attendance on this ground.

"We'd be making children dishonest if we made them go to church," such a person once said to me.

What about requiring children to go to school and making them go to bed? My experience is that the most co-operative of our offspring have times when they just don't want to do anything. Sometimes when I think the child's disinclination is justified, I step out of the picture and let him follow his mood. But plenty of times I have said, "Come along now, it is time to go to school," or "It is time to have supper," or "It is time to go to bed."

I seriously doubt if in so doing I have forced dishonesty on my child. Rather, have I not simply reinforced him in his own effort to become self-directing? Why, then, is it so different to say, "Come along now, it is time to go to church"?

The theory is, I suppose, that if during their junior years children are segregated in religious services planned especially for them (or kept completely away from all formal religious services at all), then they will develop more genuinely as religious persons and so when they "come of age" they will decide for themselves that they want to join the adult worship service. Does it work out that way in churches where children worship only apart from their elders? I put the question to a teacher of high-school-age children who have come up through a segregated-by-age church. As high-school students their church-school session lasts only an hour, and they are now free for the first time in their church career to join their parents and attend the regular church worship service.

"Do they go to church now?" I asked.

"I am afraid," she answered, "that most of them go home instead."

I agree that certain religious instruction and definite service and social projects are done most effectively in small groups formed around age units. So I like to see churches plan a program of religious education to supplement and implement the worship experience of the church congregation. But I do not like to see church leaders planning programs that exclude a child from participating in regular worship with his own family in the large church family.

I am not ignoring the personality development of children. I am thinking specifically of just that. My conviction is that the child who

is deprived of fellowship in the church family worship is deprived of an enriching experience that could make an important and unique contribution to his growth as a person. There is already, in the field of child study, a trend away from too much age segregation. In a few years I think we will be reading a good deal about the need of children for experiences in cross-section age groups. Why shouldn't the church, which so much needs to let its meaning and its message permeate the *whole* life of people, lead out in rethinking its congregational worship service in terms of family congregations? Why shouldn't families who find themselves torn in a dozen directions with the activities of all of their members take advantage of congregational worship as a very special thing they regularly can do together?

I am not saying that if all the mamas and papas suddenly decided to take their offspring to church, or if all churches suddenly announced that every Sunday would be Family Sunday, the millennium would have arrived. The achievement of the kind of family worship experience I am talking about demands a good deal of thinking and planning both on the part of parents and on the part of the ministers. In the first place, it presupposes that a sense of the need of worship is genuinely recognized by parents. Only men and women who care sincerely about the quality of human life can ever expect their children to join them happily and reverently in a service of worship. People who go to church to show off clothes, or to strengthen their community prestige, or to gossip across the aisle, will have a hard time explaining to young Junior why we sit quietly in church. Likewise, it presupposes on the part of the minister a persisting awareness of the importance to the congregation of even the young toddlers. If a minister thinks of himself as a person whose responsibility is to lead a group of people in an *experience* of worship, then he will not find it difficult to include little people as well as big people in the service. If he is interested primarily in delivering an eloquent sermon that will impress the visiting "call committee" or satisfy the theological prejudices of some master of money, then he will not be too happy to see the chuck-full-of-vitamin-twins arrive.

Assuming that pastors care about the families and families appreciate the church, what can be done to make the church service a good service for families? The most important thing is that children should feel included, that they should know that they as well as their parents are going to church to worship God. The parents could help by explaining the purposes and procedures of the church to children before

they go to church. During the service one of the parents could quietly guide the youngest children in an understanding of what is being done and how people do it:

"The organist is playing while the people come in and we all sit quietly and listen."

"We stand up and sing now."

"The minister is going to read to us out of the Bible."

"The ushers are passing the plate for us to put our offering on it."

"We bow our heads for prayer."

Little children love to conform!

We so appreciated the church where the pastor had a children's story each Sunday—a short, short story from the Scriptures or from life—but long enough to remind the youngsters that their minister had them in mind as he prepared the service. Some congregations have a children's hymn. This does not mean that the adults indulgently join in singing a nursery jingle. It means that at least one hymn is especially chosen with the vocal range and thought-concepts of the younger children particularly in mind. Invariably these hymns for children (like "This Is My Father's World" and "Tell Me the Story of Jesus") are adult favorites as well. The adults have a special treat when some singing six-year-old looks up and smiles a toothless smile of pleasure that the grownups are joining in her favorite hymn.

It is my experience that children over three can learn to attend a complete worship service without the experience proving strenuous for him or disconcerting for other people. But if parents or pastors think it is better for the youngest children to be attended away from the church service at least during the sermon, then I still think that the little tots ought to go with their parents to some portion of the service. The capacity for awe and reverence at thirty is different from the capacity at three. But let us not forget that in a three-year-old's way it is there and ought not to be neglected by the church. Parents could take a three- or four-year-old child into church for the first ten minutes of the service. Then if it seemed that he had stayed as long as he could stay with profit, one of them could quietly take him out to walk in the sunshine or to be attended in the church nursery. The length of time the little one stays in church could gradually be increased as the child grows older.

Some churches have a definite place in the service when young children leave their parents with whom they have been sitting for the first part of the worship service. They go to a separate room or chapel

where the service is continued especially for them during the sermon period. If this is done, I should like to see the children return to the congregation during the singing of the last hymn and slip into the pews with their parents so that they would all be together to receive the minister's benediction. Many times family members who are unself-conscious in their closeness will slip hand into hand as they bow to the words:

May the Lord bless thee and keep thee.

May the Lord make his face to shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee.

May the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace.

In a middle-sized Midwestern community there is a church pew the fifth row from the front on the righthand side. Every Sunday the Macks sit there. Fred sits on one end with his arm around fifteen-year-old Frances. Lois, his wife, further down the seat smiles across at Fred as she settles between eight-year-old Claude and six-year-old Jane. The two youngest go through a certain amount of wiggling while they get themselves and their coats adjusted to the seat and grin or wave at all their friends in the congregation. When the first note of the processional hymn is sounded they come to attention. Fred and Frances share a hymnal. Claude sings out of his own. Lois leans down to Jane's level (as she used to lean down to Fran and Claude) to help a young reader follow the lines of the hymn. When the congregation stands, all the Macks stand. When the minister asks the people to bow in silent prayer, the Macks share the silence. When a psalm is read responsively, the Macks join in the response. When the sermon comes, Fran listens intently and sometimes cannot resist a quick-whispered comment about it to her father. Claude listens most of the time because the minister speaks a language he likes. Jane listens part of the time and draws part of the time. If it is Communion Sunday, the children accept the symbolic cup with their parents. I expect they are unconsciously memorizing the communion invitation I learned by hearing when I was a child:

Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors . . . draw near with faith. . . .

The Macks are not queer people. They wear no sad faces and harbor no deep-seated inhibitions. Everyone who knows them thinks of them as a "grand family." They are a family full of fun and friendliness and also full of good hard-headed common sense. Religion for

the Macks is neither a perfunctory sort of ritual nor a magical kind of superstition. Religion for them is a dynamic faith in a God of Love at the heart of the universe—a profound respect for Jesus the Christ, who can save human beings to a working relationship with an infinite God and to a creative relationship with all men. Religion for the Macks is a day-by-day way of assuming responsibility for the burdens of people everywhere. The Macks individually and collectively think more than the average family thinks about the needs of the world and what can be done about them. The Macks do more than the average family does to help raise the level of human existence. The Macks have more than average faith in people and in God.

Sometimes I get awfully discouraged with the magnitude and complexity of the snarled-up skein of human affairs. I wonder if in all the world there are people with enough care-how and courage really to make some headway at untangling the mess. Then I remember a church pew five rows from the front on the righthand side; and I take heart.

The Faith of Maxwell Anderson

JOHN D. LEE

Anderson recurrently stresses every man's need of a faith individually chosen—an emphasis which Christians may appreciate though they deem it insufficient.

"I HAVE NEVER," writes Maxwell Anderson, in the preface to *Journey to Jerusalem*, a play concerning the early life of Jesus, "been a professing Christian." This is a strange statement to come from a man who was born in a Baptist parsonage in Pennsylvania and was reared in other parsonages, as his father moved his family from parish to parish through Ohio and Iowa to North Dakota.

It may well be that Anderson was a rebel from his childhood. There is sufficient evidence of his rebellion in other fields than religion to indicate that this may be true. Did he, when he had reached the Baptist "age of accountability," when he would normally have been baptized and accepted into the Baptist communion, decide that he wanted no part of Christianity?

We have no right to question the truth of the statement. One wonders, however, if he would not have been nearer to the exact truth if he had written that he had not "for some years" or "since he had been grown" been a professing Christian. It would have been most difficult to grow up in the home of a minister, of whatever Christian denomination, and to have remained outside the fold of the church.

Let us admit, however, that, in the commonly accepted meaning of the phrase, Maxwell Anderson is not a Christian. Let us say that his religion does not follow the accepted channels of churchmanship. It is neither orthodox nor traditional nor denominational. It does not follow any creed—except his own private creed—and sometimes his indignation at injustice, particularly when exhibited by a Christian minister, might lead one to wonder if he could be entirely happy in any recognized Christian communion.

Nevertheless, one who reads his plays or sees them performed cannot doubt that he is a man of deep religious faith. There are those, no doubt, who might wish that Mr. Anderson would express his religion in a more conventional manner. They distrust anybody who does not conform to a particular pattern in matters religious. But those of us who

welcome any ally in the struggle of spirituality against secularism accept him gladly. For Maxwell Anderson, more than any other active playwright, demonstrates in his plays an admiration and respect for the invincible resilience of the human spirit and his confidence in its ultimate victory over the forces of evil.

After graduating from the University of North Dakota, young Anderson first taught school before casting his lot with journalism. He worked on newspapers from San Francisco to New York, where he joined the staff of the old *World*. There Anderson met a fellow staff member, Laurence Stallings, who, after witnessing a performance of Anderson's first play, *White Desert*, suggested that the two men combine their talents. Stallings had served with the Marines in the first World War and had contributed a leg to the preservation of democracy. Anderson had not been in service, but out of his knowledge of play construction and Stallings' knowledge of the doughboy's vocabulary, they contrived *What Price Glory*, the first true-to-life play about that war.

The success of the play convinced Anderson that he could make a living writing for the theater. He gave up his job on the newspaper to devote himself to his new craft. Since that time he has written more than twenty full-length plays, in addition to several in collaboration and some shorter ones on his own.

These plays may be divided into two groups: plays of social anger and human pity, and plays of romanticism. Sometimes these two streams have joined, as in *Winterset*, and when that happens, it results in his best work.

There are times when Anderson is deeply critical of formal religion, and at such times he does not pull his punches. He does not hesitate to attack those pious pretenses which sometimes pass for true religion. He is as bitter in his anger at religious intolerance and the false piety which too often clothes itself in Christian garb as he is at social injustice. He does not hesitate to aim his sharpest barbs at Christianity when it seems to deserve them.

Nowhere is this impatience with false piety as a substitute for true religion better shown than in *Wingless Victory*. This play tells the story of the return to Salem, Massachusetts, of Nathaniel McQueston, a handsome and attractive ne'er-do-well, after a voyage to the South Seas. Leaving home penniless, he had returned with a cargo of sufficient value to make him wealthy, a native princess from the Celebes as his wife, and two children.

The Rev. Phineas McQueston, Nat's brother, welcomes his return with less than enthusiasm and such words (to himself, of course) as

. . . . the ways
of God are strange. The sinner always triumphant;
the babbler and the reveller sit at meat,
while those who serve Him hope for a dinner of herbs
and rise up hungry.¹

It does not matter to Phineas that Oparre, Nathaniel's native wife,

. . . . knows her Bible forward and back as well
as any divine in Salem. Taught herself
her English out of it, runs with Bible talk
like an Old Testament prophet.²

Or that she is a Christian. All that matters to Phineas is that Nat has become wealthy and has returned home to lord it over him, thus making the ways of God more incomprehensible still. Nor is Nat fooled. With bitter memories of the travesties on their faith which the church people of Salem have perpetrated in the past, he flings into Phineas' face:

Your church sells out
like all the others, regularly. Who built
the fold you ply your trade in now? A thief,
that robbed your flock of sheep for thirty years
and paid his way to paradise by standing
the costs of their meetinghouse.³

Oparre herself, feeling the hostility which her arrival has aroused, comments, in a speech addressed to her ministerial brother-in-law:

. . . . if the Christ you worship
gives sanctuary only to his own
lest they be polluted, say this at once and we
shall rouse the children, and be away. I came
only with a hope.⁴

Unfortunately for Nathaniel, Phineas learns that there is a dark suspicion surrounding the means by which the wealth of the Indies has been secured. By threatening to expose Nathaniel and cause his prosecution, Phineas secures his brother's consent to send his wife back to her people. It is in the speech with which Oparre confronts the entire family of her husband that Anderson displays the intensity of his indignation against the religion of men like Phineas:

¹ Maxwell Anderson, *Wingless Victory*, in *Eleven Verse Plays*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1942. p. 18. All quotations in this article are used by permission of Maxwell Anderson.

² *Ibid.*, p. 32.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

I have been misled
 a long time by your Christ and his beggar's doctrine,
 written for beggars! Your beseeching, pitiful Christ!
 The old gods are best, the gods of blood and bronze,
 and the arrows dipped in venom. You worship them, too,
 Moloch and Jahveh of your Old Testament,
 requiring sacrifice of blood, revenging
 all save their chosen!⁵

And again the author's anger blazes out in the speech of Oparre, as she awaits the turning of the tide in the cabin of the ship which is to take her away from Salem:

God of the children,
 God of the lesser children of the earth,
 the black, the unclean, the vengeful, you are mine
 now as when I was a child. He came too soon,
 this Christ of peace. Men are not ready yet.
 Another hundred thousand years they must drink
 your potion of tears and blood.⁶

In spite of himself, however, Anderson runs a formal religious thread through *Mary of Scotland*, a thread made necessary by the historical situation. The conflict of the play is increased by the fact that Mary is Roman Catholic while Elizabeth of England is Protestant.

The play opens with a meeting between Mary and John Knox, upon her arrival in Scotland to take over the rule of the country. Knox has opposed her coming and confronts her with threats of Protestant opposition, to be led by him. Opinions differ among historians as to the degree to which John Knox was the villain in Mary's story. For his own purpose, however, which is to gain the audience's sympathy for Mary, Anderson chooses to adopt that point of view which portrays Knox as bigoted and intolerant, if not actually involved personally in the campaign against Mary. Perhaps Mary's opinion of Knox is not Anderson's, but it would be hard to attribute an opinion of any other sort to him, in the light of the words which he has Mary speak in the course of the play's later action:

You see, Master Knox, you are not the judge who will sit over us in the Last Judgment! You are instead an elderly gentleman of provincial learning and fanatical beliefs, lately married to a niece of your own some forty years your junior, and one who conducts his conversations almost exclusively in quotations from the Old Testament. If you will talk sensibly with me I shall talk sensibly

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

with you, but if you come here to frighten me I shall regard you as a most ridiculous antediluvian figure, and find you very funny.⁷

Obviously, Anderson finds him a dangerous figure, if not definitely a menace to society. One is tempted to say that, although not a Roman Catholic himself, Anderson has assumed the typical Roman interpretation of John Knox. In fairness to him, however, one might also add that the basic premise of his play required such an interpretation, and once having embarked upon his thesis, he was forced to depict the Scottish reformer in such a light, in the interest of dramatic consistency.

If faith in God demands that one have, first, a faith in man and in his capacity for growth into Godlikeness, Anderson can qualify. This note sounds time and again in every play he writes. In *Mary of Scotland* one finds Mary expressing her philosophy of life, based upon confidence in the innate decency of people and things:

This is my faith, dear my lord, that all men
Love better good than evil, cling rather to truth
Than falseness, answer fair dealing with fair return;
And this too; those thrones will fall that are built on blood
And craft, that as you'd rule long, you must rule well—
This has been true, and is true.⁸

In *Key Largo* it sounds again, this note of faith in humankind. It sounds as clear as a bugle call in the refusal of Victor, the young Spanish-American volunteer in the Spanish Loyalist army. His companions, learning that they are to be abandoned to almost certain death by their leaders, prepare to save themselves, but Victor remains, saying:

I have to believe
there's something in the world that isn't evil—
I have to believe there's something in the world
that would rather die than accept injustice—
something
positive for good—that can't be killed—
or die inside. And now that the sky's found empty
a man has to be his own god for himself—
has to prove to himself that a man can die
for what he believes—if ever the time comes to him
when he's asked to choose, and it just so happens
it's up to me tonight.—And I stay here.
I don't say it's up to you—I couldn't tell
about another man—or any of you—
but I know it's up to me.⁹

⁷ *Mary of Scotland*, in *Eleven Verse Plays*, p. 77.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁹ *Key Largo*, in *Eleven Verse Plays*, p. 21.

In the same play, the playwright reveals the futility of a philosophy of negation, of believing in nothing. King, the hero of the play, admits in the last act that

A man must die
for what he believes—if he's unfortunate
enough to have to face it in his time—
and if he won't then he'll end up believing
in nothing at all—and that's death, too.¹⁰

Winterset closes with a statement of faith from the lips of old Esdras whose daughter, the heroine, has died with the hero from a gangster's bullets:

Oh, Miriamne
and Mio—Mio, my son—know this where you lie,
this is the glory of earth-born men and women,
not to cringe, never to yield, but standing,
take defeat implacable and defiant,
die unsubmitting.

On this star,
in this hard star-adventure, knowing not
what the fires mean to right and left, nor whether
a meaning was intended or presumed,
man can stand up, and look out blind, and say:
in all these turning lights I find no clue,
only a masterless night, and in my blood
no certain answer, yet is my mind my own,
yet is my heart a cry toward something dim
in distance, which is higher than I am
and makes me emperor of the endless dark
even in seeking!¹¹

In *Winterset* Anderson has made a second attempt—the first being *Gods of the Lightning*, written in collaboration—to dramatize the story of Sacco and Vanzetti, of bitter memory to American liberals. When one turns from such a play of burning indignation at injustice to another historical romance, such as *The Masque of Kings*, one finds Anderson still returning to the problem of faith and the necessity for it. If we were to single out one theme which keeps recurring in his plays, like the theme of a symphony, we would find it to be this: Faith one must have!

The Masque of Kings is another attempt to solve the mystery which

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

¹¹ *Winterset*, in *Eleven Verse Plays*, p. 133.

has surrounded the deaths of Prince Rudolph of Austria-Hungary and his mistress, the Baroness Vetsera, at Mayerling in 1889. In it Anderson treats his theories about government, which he had previously treated in *Valley Forge* and *Night Over Taos*. Rudolph represents the new groping for freedom among the down-trodden masses in Franz Joseph's empire and sets himself up as their champion. Spied upon in every action by his father's representatives, Rudolph finally realizes that there is no hope for relief from his father and no opportunity to lead a successful rebellion against him. Even in his despair at such an end to his dreams, however, Rudolph retains his faith in something greater than himself. He states that faith in these words:

If you'll go stop
three tradesmen on the street, and ask the three
what it is they live by, they'll reply at once
bread, meat and drink, and they'll be certain of it;
. . . . nothing will be said
of faith in things unseen, or following
the gleam, just bread and meat and a can of wine
to wash it down. But if you know them well
behind the fish-eyes and the bellies, if
you know them better than they do, each one
burns candles at some altar of his mind
in secret; secret often from himself
each is a priest to some dim mystery
by which he lives. Strip him of that, and bread
and meat and wine won't nourish him. Fish-eyed.
pot-bellied, standing over counters, still
without his chuckle-headed hidden faith
he dies and goes to dust.¹²

Sooner or later, it has been said, every playwright, whatever his stature and achievements, confronts the Maid of Orleans. Joan of Arc has exercised a strong fascination over such diverse minds as Mark Twain and Bernard Shaw. It must have required great courage on Anderson's part to approach Joan, at least while Shaw is still alive, in view of the magnificent interpretation of her life and work which the latter has written. Anderson does overcome the temptation to write a long and elaborate introduction to his treatment of Joan in the published edition of his play. Nevertheless, that he has considered her at all is a tribute to his courage and his daring.

It is always difficult for an author to sink himself into a historical

¹² *The Masque of Kings*, in *Eleven Verse Plays*, p. 123.

character to such an extent that he can speak properly of motives. It is difficult, also, for a playwright to handle the problem caused by a play-within-a-play. Even Shakespeare himself was none too successful in using such a device in *Hamlet*, and lesser playwrights have stumbled more spectacularly.

Anderson undertakes to probe the motives which led Joan to do the things she did; and in the course of that probing, participated in by the cast which is rehearsing a performance of Joan's life story, there arises again the subject of faith. Mary Gray, who is playing Joan, is considerably disturbed by the author's implications that Joan allowed herself to be used by unscrupulous men in order to gain the ends they were seeking, and that she herself utilized such men and methods for the attainment of her purpose, which was to rid France of the English and crown the Dauphin at Rheims. Mary is sure that Joan would not have done certain deeds which the play's author has written for her to do, under any circumstances, so far are they from her own ideas of right and wrong.

During a crisis in the rehearsals, when Mary's ideas as to how the part should be played clash with those of the author which Masters, the stage manager, feels obligated to carry out, the latter as protagonist for the playwright answers some questions posed by another member of the company:

LONG. Why can't a fellow just live by common-sense, without faith, dreams or religion?

MASTERS. A man may keep to the right-hand side of the street out of common-sense, but common-sense has nothing to do with where he's going. You'd never do anything, living by common-sense.

DOLLNER. Couldn't a man live by science?

MASTERS. Hell, if you live you have to be going somewhere. You have to choose a direction. And science is completely impartial. It doesn't give a damn which way you go. It can invent the atom bomb but it can't tell you whether to use it or not. Science is like—well, it's like a flashlight in a totally dark room measuring two billion light-years across and with walls that shift away from you as you go toward them. The flash can show you where your feet are on the floor: it can show you the furniture or the people close by; but as for which direction you should take in that endless room it can tell you nothing.

LONG. But I don't have any faith.

MASTERS. O, yes, you do. And you live by it. Everybody has a notion of what the world's like and what he's like in it what you think about the world is your faith, and if you begin to doubt it you have to put something in its place quick or you'll fall apart. A man has to have a faith, and a culture has to have one—and an army. An army may move on its belly, but it wouldn't move at all if it didn't believe in something.

JEFFSON. That might go for an army, but not for me.

MASTERS. No? You look hard at yourself, any one of you, and you'll find you're living by something you can't explain—maybe a formal religion, maybe a crazy-quilt philosophy you made up for yourself out of odds and ends, maybe a cause, maybe the S.P.C.A. or the Baconian theory or Freud or scientific research or communism or Christian Science or antivivisection, or somebody you're in love with, or an institution that needs cherishing—like our poor old theatre here on Manhattan. . . .

MISS SADLER. What's your religion, Mr. Masters?

MASTERS. I guess democracy. I believe in democracy, and I believe the theatre is the temple of democracy. A democratic society needs a church without a creed—where anybody is allowed to talk as long as he can hold an audience—and that's what the theatre is—though it's sort of dwindling down to a side-chapel here, lately. . . .

KIPNER. What did you mean when you said everybody has to have a faith but no faith will bear critical examination? . . .

MASTERS. Well, can I prove that democracy is better than dictatorship? Certainly not. Can I prove that the theatre is the temple of democracy? Certainly not. I can't even prove that it's a good influence. I just have faith that it is. And every faith's like that—every faith looks ridiculous to those who don't have it.

NOBLE. But if no faith will stand critical examination, doesn't that leave the human race in a very doubtful position?

MASTERS. It's always been in a doubtful position. We moderns have a way of feeling very smug about poor Joan of Lorraine back there in the dark ages, believing in her Voices and doing what they told her. But not one of us believes in anything more solid. . . .

We live by illusions and assumptions and concepts, every one of them as questionable as the Voices Joan heard in the garden. We take on our religions the way we fall in love, and we can't defend one any more than the other. . . .

More and more men are going to realize that it's our destiny to be in the dark and yet go forward—to doubt our religions and yet live by them. To know that our faith can't be proved and yet stick to it. . . .¹³

Mr. Anderson's insistence on the privilege, even the necessity, of every man's choosing his faith for himself, without recourse to other men's faiths, appears not only in his plays but in his published essays and prefaces. In an essay entitled "Whatever Hope We Have" he sets this principle forth:

Each man and woman among us, with a short and harried life to live, must decide for himself what attitude he will take toward the shifting patterns of government, justice, religion, business, morals, and personal conduct. . . . Whether he chooses to conform or not to conform, every man's religion is his own, every man's politics is his own, every man's vice or virtue is his own, for he alone makes decisions for himself.

And each must make his choices, now as always, without sufficient knowledge

¹³ *Joan of Lorraine*. Washington: Anderson House, 1947. pp. 82-85.

and without sufficient wisdom, without certainty of our origin, without certainty of what undiscovered forces lie beyond known scientific data, without certainty of the meaning of life, if it has a meaning, and without an inkling of our racial destiny.¹⁴

One is inclined to agree with him that man does not have sufficient knowledge in the realms of the spiritual, or, at least, that his scientific progress has far outstripped his progress in the fields of religion and morals. However, one is also inclined to ask Mr. Anderson whether it is wise to ignore such guides as we may have in those realms, or whether it would not be better to use them in matters of guidance. In other words, why do we not follow the arrows we have, rather than complain because we do not have more of them? The Chinese say it is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness. The Christian would say that one cannot well expect additional torches for the lighting of his path if he refuses to follow those he has.

Anderson continues that there is an occasional prophetic voice which comes from time to time, and an occasional flash of light from the scientists, but that, by and large, there is not much to help us on our way. He has much to say of the destiny which he conceives to lie ahead of man, though he admits readily that he finds no proof of any gigantic scheme somewhere understood. He does concede, however, that, though there are no proofs, there are indications, which seem to him to promise something further:

. . . . in the idealism of children and young men, in the sayings of such teachers as Christ and Buddha, in the vision of the world and in the discoveries of pure science, as it pushes away the veils of fact to reveal new problems, new laws, new mysteries, new goals for the eternal dream. The dream of the race is that it may make itself better and wiser than it is, and every great philosopher or artist who has ever appeared among us has turned his face away from what man is, toward whatever seems to him most godlike that man may become.¹⁵

As for his own creed, Anderson writes:

. . . . I myself accept his (the artist's) creed as my own. I make my spiritual code out of my limited knowledge of great music, great poetry, and great plastic and graphic arts, including with these, *not above them*, [*italics mine*] such wisdom as the Sermon on the Mount and the last chapter of Ecclesiastes. The test of a man's inspiration for me is not whether he spoke from a temple or the stage of a theatre, from a martyr's fire or a garden in Hampstead. The test of a message is its continuing effect on the minds of men over a period of generations.¹⁶

¹⁴ *The Essence of Tragedy*. Washington: Anderson House, 1940. p. 19.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

What makes such a message last, then? What is the plus quantity or quality in it which makes it endure? Has not inspiration fallen in greater measure on some minds than on others, and does not the Christian believe that it fell supremely and uniquely in the life of Jesus Christ? Though I would be the last to claim that the tests of universality or continuity or even of popularity are final, surely they do have some validity in the making of man's faith. Surely the generations have not been altogether deluded and the historic Christian faith entirely false!

Men do "cling to what central verities they can rescue or manufacture," and not because "without a core of belief neither man nor nation has the courage to go on." They cling to those central verities because what is deepest in man's nature responds to their appeal and proves them to be verities and not assumptions.

For Anderson, the theater has supplanted the church. In it he sees the place where man can become conscious of his destiny, as he sees other entangled persons work out their fates.

The rebellion of Antigone, who breaks the laws of men through adherence to a higher law of affection, the rebellion of Prometheus, who breaks the law of the gods to bring fire to men, the rebellion of God in *The Green Pastures* against the rigid doctrine of the Old Testament, the rebellion of Tony in *They Knew What They Wanted* . . . , the rebellion of Liliom against the heavenly law which asked him to betray his own integrity . . . , these are all instances to me of the groping of men toward an excellence dimly apprehended, seldom possible of definition. They are evidence to me that the theatre at its best is a religious affirmation, an age-old rite restating and reassuring man's belief in his own destiny and ultimate hope.¹⁷

In 1940 Anderson found himself meditating on the subject of values and what the possession or lack of values in an individual life, or a nation's life, may mean to that individual or that nation. In his meditations, he came perilously close (for him) to admitting a faith in historic Christianity. He wrote, in his preface to *Journey to Jerusalem*, a dramatic treatment of the journey Jesus took with his parents to Jerusalem on the occasion of his twelfth birthday:

. . . if we are to believe in ourselves we must—and there is no way out of it—believe that there is a purpose and pattern in the universe, that man can contribute to this purpose and that every individual man has a sacred right to follow his own intuition toward that purpose. . . . It should be every man's right and privilege to choose his own faith or work it out from his own flashes of revelation. But faith we must have.¹⁸

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

¹⁸ *Journey to Jerusalem*. Washington: Anderson House, 1940. p. vi.

It cannot be denied that a statement such as the above comes perilously close to admitting as much as Christianity claims. Christianity would go several steps further and say that the purpose in the universe is the achievement of the Kingdom of God on earth and the pattern for that Kingdom is to be found in the Scriptures; but no Christian would deny Mr. Anderson fellowship because he finds himself hovering outside the door, afraid to come inside. Furthermore, the admission which the playwright makes in the same preface brings him not far from the Christian fold:

Weakened though it has been of late years, Christianity is still the strongest influence among us toward that individual dignity upon which individual freedom is established. I have never been a professing Christian, yet I have always found in the teachings of Jesus the most convincing evidence of what we are accustomed to call inspiration. The words of the Sermon on the Mount seem to cut across the dark sky of Palestine under the Caesars like God's own levin flash, lighting up centuries past and centuries to come. There were many great prophets among the Jews, and their words are still impressive. There have been great prophets and seers in the Occident since that time, but I know of no other poem, book, play, passage or sermon which compresses so much dynamic and shattering wisdom into words. My own faith is that these poised, unhurried words come out of depths of meaning which the scientist cannot plumb, and that these words and others from the same depths will, in their own way and time, annihilate Hitler and all Hitlers by teaching men faith in themselves and in their destiny.¹⁰

From such a statement in 1940 to the publication of *Joan of Lorraine*, which appeared in 1947, stretch seven chronological years, though those years have compassed a revolution in the history of the world. A war has intervened and in addition man has proven his ability to create a larger monster than Mrs. Shelley's scientist.

Thus one may be pardoned who reads into *Joan* more than the author may have intended to say. For example, one may be pardoned if he suspects that Mr. Anderson is beginning to have his doubts as to the sufficiency of the theater as a replacement for the church. One suspects that he is beginning to see that the theater, however strong it may have been in the past as an ally of Christianity, is not yet a substitute for that institution nor for the ministry which it offers to mankind.

Mr. Anderson has been brought up short by the story of the simple peasant girl who trusted her voices too implicitly for the Church to be able to approve her subsequent conduct as a result of her obedience to those voices. In all history there is no clearer exposition of the possibility of personal communion between God and man than in the story

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. vi-vii.

of Joan. Joan was burned because she fell into the hands of the English, but back of that was the feeling of the Church that such people were dangerous and it could have saved her if it had chosen. There is no escaping the fact that her trial was a church trial, after which she was turned over to the English, rather than a civil trial.

Since the publication of *Joan of Lorraine* no further play has come from Anderson's pen. It well may be that his next will take him in another direction altogether. Perhaps he may have a change of heart or a change of faith which will nullify all his past professions. It is more likely, however, that he will find himself closer to Christianity rather than farther from it, and nearer to an orthodox faith than he has yet come. Even if he does not take the further step, those who are deeply committed to the Christian faith as the most satisfactory answer to the skepticism of this age may be grateful for such measures of assistance as they have already been given. It is an occasion for gratitude that there is one man writing for the contemporary theater who is not afraid to align himself alongside the forces of faith, as over against doubt. However uncertain the Anderson trumpet may be, it is not silent!

The Liturgical Movement in Catholic Circles

GERALD ELLARD, S.J.

A Catholic authority on liturgy reviews the fifty years of growing concern for lay participation—points out a basic connection with the Church's social concern.

THE LONGEST PAPAL encyclical letter (it is said) in the Vatican's history has just recently (Nov. 20, 1947) brought what is known as the liturgical movement clearly to the forefront of Catholic attention and study the world around. The Vatican has so completely proved its sympathy for man, modern man, under the crushing weight of his manifold problems, that it might seem strange in this critical hour to have Vatican authorities elaborate a document of fifteen thousand words on worship, the forms of worship, the doctrines expressed in worship, and certain aberrations threatening to spoil the progress of the liturgical movement, as it is known among Catholics. The subjoined essay aims at providing non-Catholic readers with a bird's-eye view of the movement now daily achieving wider and deeper significance in the religious world. Progress up to 1947 is sketched out in some general fashion, and, at the end, the most significant developments in the United States are listed. Broadly speaking, the papal program is still so far from full realization as to invite comparison with the century plant of the Southwest, which flowers, it is said, only after a hundred years in the sun. Perhaps here, too, the *first* hundred years are the hardest!

I. "ACTIVE LAY-PARTICIPATION IS INDISPENSABLE"—*Pius X*

The barrier between priest and congregation has been deplored so much as to be something of a Catholic "Wailing Wall," but remedial changes had not been made since the sixteenth-century Council of Trent. Of all the regrettable aspects of the situation the vocal music at the sung (or High) Mass was one of the worst; for here the old three-part division between priest and choir *and congregation* had been everywhere upset, so that the people sat silent, while choristers, besides their own parts, sang the people's too. They sang them in concert-style music, or even in operatic arias, in lieu of community prayer-in-song.

Such developments were precisely what Giuseppe Sarto had been attacking—and changing—as parish priest, at Salzano and Tambolo. When he went as bishop to Mantua he addressed his flock, but still, one will note, in the optative mood: “If only we could bring it about that *all the faithful* would sing the Ordinary of the Mass, *Kyrie, Gloria, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei*, even as they are now singing [at evening devotions] the Litany of Loreto and the *Tantum Ergo*. . . . Then the people would nurture their piety and their devotion by taking a real part in the sacred liturgy!”¹

But after some years in Mantua, and a further full decade in Venice, the speaker, now become Pope Pius X, could say in an unqualified *indicative*: “There is no village [in Venetia], however small, that has not its own *schola cantorum*, which accompanies the sacred functions with a chant that arouses in all who hear it the most satisfying impressions. In very many places *all the people take part* in chanting Vespers and Mass, young and old, all of them having been instructed by the pastor or curate. What has been done in those regions,” Pius was resolved when he was chosen pope (1903), “can and must be done” in Rome, and around the world as well. This is the way he summed it up for bishops: “My one great desire is that during the sacred functions *all the people sing together* in a loud voice.” But how change the habit-locked silence of Catholics at Mass in Italy, or Indiana, or Ithaca? It would take shock therapy of very high voltage to galvanize such “lockjaw”: it would take no less than a clear spiritual principle reiterated to the echo.

So, by way of starting his reform for enlisting the active participation of the whole congregation in the music of High Mass, Pius X took pains to formulate a general guiding principle, in the light of which his program for the music is but one application. He thereby charted all that he and others were to do in the coming multiple endeavor known as the liturgical movement. Couched in the periodic style of curial documents, the principle runs as follows in literal translation:

Filled as we are with the most ardent desire *to see the true Christian spirit flourish* in every respect and *be preserved by all the people*, we deem it necessary to provide before aught else for the sanctity and dignity of the temple, in which *the faithful assemble* for no other object than that of *acquiring this spirit* from its foremost and indispensable fount, which is *the active participation in the most holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church*. (Nov. 22, 1903; italics mine.)

¹ Most of the papal documents here in question are published in the Vatican organs, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* up to 1908, and *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* since then. But since we quote only after translating into English, it has hardly seemed worth while to append complete bibliographical references.

This was very soon being shortened to read: "Active lay-participation in the liturgy is a foremost and indispensable fount of the true Christian spirit." Priests were soon reflecting widely: "The more actively, the more fruitfully."

Now, of course, the highest and most exalted lay-participation in the Mass is by the reception of Holy Communion, the action described by Pope Pius XII as "The reception of the Victim, Who is the Communion of the celebrant and the faithful" (Nov. 10, 1940). Divines had been debating for ages as to the precise conditions under which people, religious or secular, should be permitted frequent, even daily, reception of the Eucharist. This debate was ended by Pius's decreeing (Dec. 20, 1905), that all free from known mortal sin, approaching with a good intention, and complying with the customary fasting provision, should thenceforth everywhere have access every day. The age level for the admission of little children to their First Holy Communion was later lowered to the very dawn of childish discretion, "so that, after First Communion, they shall often approach the Holy Table, even daily, if possible, as Jesus Christ and Mother Church desire" (Aug. 8, 1910). Closest Mass-participation for the grownups by their Communion, and closest Mass-participation for the children by *their* Communion, too.

With the publication that same year (1905) of a catechism and prayer-book for the Catholic laity of Rome, Pius X included the full version of the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass, recommending the Mass-text as the preferred prayers for Sunday use. This action of his was soon translated into the aphorism that was never actually verified (we believe) as a direct quotation: "Do not merely pray during Mass: *pray the Mass.*"

How can people sing without a manual? So Pius ordered, that same summer, handy *Kyriales* to be made available at Rome and the sample *Mass of the Angels* to be given out in leaflet form to everyone. The relevant slogan this time is an actual saying of his: "Do not merely sing during Mass: sing the Mass!"

So Pius was fostering every initiative that promised to promote a closer and more active lay-participation in the Mass. What was the world reaction to all this? There was at first a great and very grateful increase in the reception of frequent and daily Communion. There was, too, a great stir everywhere about the *forthcoming* musical reforms, but even where good will was of the best, changes in current practice would come but slowly. As for singing congregations at High Mass, that prospect seemed remote indeed! But the idea of active lay-participation,

as applied to the *Low Mass*, was leading in some places to the group responding to the priest, and group recitation with the priest of a few parts that are "congregationally" sung at High Mass: *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei*. This practice, known now as the Dialog Mass, or *Missa Recitata*, has since gone around the world in initial fashion. Moreover, the pope's "Pray the Mass" slogan was doing away with the old-style prayerbooks, and putting missals containing the official prayers of the Mass into people's hands the world over. Still further, in the general reawakening to "the dignity and sanctity of the temple" there was a hasty discarding of unbecoming appurtenances. Nor should one fail to mention that the years 1912, 1913, and 1914 were marked in Europe by endless clerical discussion of "liturgical" (or corporate) *versus* "personal" (purely private) praying—as if either one prevented or dispensed with the other.

But the great principle notwithstanding, the people as a whole at Rome and elsewhere still sat silent during High Mass. So Pius pleaded (this time through his Cardinal Vicar for Rome) to get "the laity to co-operate by taking a more active part in the sacred functions, by singing the *Kyrie*, the *Gloria*, etc., at High Mass" (Feb. 12, 1912). But he went down to his grave knowing that what he had said of the reform of the breviary, the official book of prayers and "lessons" said daily by Catholic priests, applied to congregational song as well: "An interval of many years must elapse before this temple of the liturgy . . . may shine once more resplendent in dignity and beauty" (Oct. 23, 1913). Corporate consciousness was still notably absent, and memberly collaboration in Mass-celebration.

II. "LITURGY, THE COMMON PRAYER OF THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST"—*Pius XI*

An outsider might have thought that Pope Benedict XV (1914-22) fiddled while Christendom went up in smoke, when he wrote a long letter to the Abbey of Montserrat (Spain) to endorse the organization there of a Liturgical Congress. He sought only to have the wise papal recommendations that "the acquisition of a healthy and a profound Christian piety be constantly better known and appreciated, and more faithfully put into practice" (March 15, 1915). He enumerated these objectives as embracing: "spreading amongst the faithful an exact acquaintance with liturgy; delighting their hearts with the prayers, rites, and chants with which, in union with their common Mother, they worship

God; attracting them to take an active part in the sacred mysteries." In full war the pope could do no more than pray for such a kingdom to come with better days. It was Achille Ratti, Pius XI (1922-39), who took up the task of making the coming kingdom "liturgical."

For a liturgical crisis beset northern Italy just when he was elected. Dialog Mass, having spread rapidly in the armies of World War I, was then being "converted" to civilian use. There were no set rules for its conduct; one did it this way, another that, each as he pleased. It occurred to a preacher at Imola that it would be a good thing to have the people recite the Canon of the Mass aloud, something the priest is forbidden to do. His suggestion was finding adoption, while many turned to Rome for guidance. Some ecclesiastics there and elsewhere were pressing for a total suppression of Dialog Mass.

Rome's direction, repeated many times those early months of 1922, invariably took this form:

A. Loud recital of the Canon is an abuse: desist at once.

B. Joint-responding, and joint-reciting, while good in themselves, could readily lead to disturbance, or other impropriety: let the bishop judge on this norm (Aug. 4, 1922).

That this did not imply a papal condemnation of Dialog Mass was made clear when Pius XI himself celebrated one for men, during the International Eucharistic Congress, during the night of May 26-27, 1922. Then, too, the Vatican approved episcopal authorization for Dialog Mass, as by the Belgian hierarchy (Nov. 16, 1922). But the rather enigmatic form of the decree of August 4, 1922, continued to puzzle people as to the full papal attitude: so a further, clear-cut reply was sent to the Cardinal-Archbishop of Genoa, by which it was made clear as day that each bishop may introduce and regulate Dialog Mass for his own jurisdiction (Nov. 30, 1935). The crisis thus turned, normal development could be resumed.

Pius XI wished, first of all, to fix world attention on the Person of Christ in His character of King of Society. To achieve this end the pope could write a papal letter on the subject, or he could establish such a feast in the Catholic worship calendar. He weighed the advantages of both procedures publicly:

For imbuing the people with the faith, and leading them by faith to the interior joys of life, the annual celebration of the sacred mysteries is far more efficacious than even the most weighty documents of ecclesiastical teaching. As a rule these latter reach only a few and the more learned, whereas the former impress and

teach all the faithful. The one means, we may say, speaks but once; the other, every year and forever. The one teaches the mind only: the other speaks effectively to mind and heart, that is, **THE WHOLE MAN** (Dec. 11, 1925).

Pius several times showed his preference for thus appealing to *the whole man*.

Those *singing congregations* Pius X wished to create, where were they? The word had gone around that Rome had meanwhile changed its mind in this regard, and would be satisfied with silent congregations, if only a little more *chant* were sung by the choir overhead. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the much-evaded *Motu proprio* on Church Music almost coincided with the fiftieth anniversary of the pope's own ordination: he could thus combine both incidents, and restate the whole problem in words too clear for misunderstanding. Like his predecessor he took his stand on the self-same principle:

The chief object of Pope Pius X in . . . making certain prescriptions concerning Gregorian chant and sacred music, was to arouse and *foster a Christian spirit in the faithful*, by wisely excluding all that might ill befit the sacredness and majesty of our churches. *The faithful come to church in order to derive piety from its chief source, by taking an active part in the venerated mysteries, and the solemn public prayers of the Church.*" (Dec. 20, 1928; italics mine.)

"It is most important," the same document proclaims, "that when the faithful assist at the sacred mysteries, they should not be detached and silent spectators."

It was more than once noticed, as the pontificate progressed, that the pontiff reverted again and again to the *modern need* of a corporate, communal, social worship, as in these words of May 18, 1929: "In our day there is need of social, or communal, praying, to be voiced under the guidance of the pastors in enacting the solemn functions of the liturgy. Such an alternation of prayers will be of the greatest assistance in banishing the evils which disturb the minds of the faithful in our age."

In the new papal regulations for the degree-course in the seminaries (1931) a course on principles of Catholic worship was inculcated, to supplement the universal treatment of rubrical externals: "People make a great deal of the liturgy in our day," the pope said privately in 1935, "but not always as they ought, or as we would wish. Frequently too much importance is attached to its external aspect, to material things, whereas it is the spirit that is important: to pray in accord with the praying Church." What is this *spirit* of the praying Church, but the very vision of the Church as a world-wide, Heaven-wide, body voicing its corporate prayer through its Head and High-Priest, Christ, the Lord?

His words glow as he calls up the image: "What a spectacle for Heaven and earth is not the Church in prayer! . . . There is no hour of the day that is not hallowed by its special liturgy; there is no stage of life, great or small, that has not its part in the thanksgiving, praise, supplication and reparation of the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church" (May 3, 1932).

But by what right, what power, can the laymen, who do not consecrate the Eucharist, offer Divine Justice propitiation and reparation, fit praise and thanksgiving, save in virtue of Christ's infinite Sacrifice on Calvary, perpetually renewed on Catholic altars? All of the Church's members can and should associate themselves with Christ's Oblation to the Father, "not only for themselves, but for all mankind, and this in much the same manner as every priest" (May 9, 1928).

While Pius XI endorsed Missal use and Dialog Mass and other "external" aspects of the growing liturgical movement, there is nothing merely external about the conceptions of his preference: that the liturgy is the prayer of the whole Mystical Body of Christ, and that it is the exercise by priest and by layman of respective roles with Christ in His High-Priestly office. The result sought in all this he phrased again at the end: "That the faithful pray, and that, moreover, they pray as befits Christians, with one heart and one voice. . . . *For the formation of the social conscience.* . . . It is a work of prime importance and a noble apostolate, to preserve, restore, and increase among the faithful *the holy and genuinely traditional custom of collective prayer.* And one means of inculcating this spirit of communal prayer is through simple and dignified Gregorian chant" (Sept. 3, 1938). So Pius XI, like Pius X, ended where both of them had begun, by calling again for those singing congregations.

III. "SEEK SOCIAL ORDER IN AND THROUGH THE MASS"—Pius XII

No pope has spoken oftener of the Eucharist, and its integrating function in human society, than Pius XII (1939—). If *we* should be inclined to characterize the elapsed portion of the present pontificate as one long prayer for peace, His Holiness would doubtless add the note of a plea for peace *in and through the Eucharist*. For, in encyclical and *Motu proprio*, by Apostolic Decree and curial allocution, over the radio to the entire world, or to the Catholics of a given country, in his annual charge to Rome's Lenten preachers, as in the day-by-day addresses to pilgrims, Pius XII has thus far continuously sounded the self-same mes-

sage: "Seek social order in and through the Mass." The war years brought no less than fifty such messages from shepherd to flock. The last encyclical affords a complete and masterly exposition of the whole subject matter.

Thus it would be simply a matter of transcription, in pursuing the plan of the foregoing pages, to set out the papal mind on a half-dozen phases of the liturgical movement in the words of the present incumbent of the papal chair. But it would be more helpful and illuminating to see in general fashion how this is working out at the level of the "ultimate consumer," the parish congregation. How is the Average Catholic touched by the liturgical movement up to now?

Strangely enough, the restoration of the now prescribed Gregorian chant often meets with more success in the foreign missions than at home. If you look at home for the finished product in the external order, large congregations chanting High Mass with such spontaneous and sustained enthusiasm that it sweeps them into the practice of the other social virtues also—if you seek this in 1948, you are everywhere going to be disappointed. But if satisfied to note incipient progress, progress corresponding on the whole to sound group psychology, then you may thank God for the "tokens" everywhere observable. If Pius XII affirmed before his Lenten preachers of 1943: "The greatest, the most efficacious and the holiest of all practices of piety is the participation of the faithful in the Holy Sacrifice," he hastened to add in the very next breath: "This participation can be had in various manners, according to the inclination, the capacity, the preparation and instruction of each of the faithful" (March 13, 1943).

What is everywhere growing, especially since the masterly Encyclical on the Mystical Body (1943), is the collective and corporate offering of the Mass, the visible priest linking the laity with the invisible High-Priest, Jesus Christ, and all, Christ and priest and congregation in respective degree, collaborating in the performance of one organic Act of Worship. Also being "learned" or "relearned," as the case may be, is that social side of Holy Communion, whereby "in a divine, ineffable way we are *brought into union with each other* and with the Divine Head of the whole Body" (June 29, 1943). These two phases of "corporation" and an ever greater "con-corporation," so to speak, are enormous spiritual gains. While these two factors are not independent of the "inclination, capacity, and preparation" of the group as a whole, neither are they hampered in any single soul by waiting on the "slowest communal denom-

inator." Let us quickly call the roll of Catholic groups, and give a thumbnail reply as to how each seems to react by inclination, capacity, and preparation.

Belgium, before World War II, thanks to an *entente cordiale* between Cardinal Mercier, Abbot Marmion, and Dom Lambert Beauduin, was perhaps the farthest along the road. Annual Liturgical Weeks began in Belgium in 1912. The hierarchy, since 1923, has its official committee for liturgical action, with a definite and systematic program. In near-by Holland collaboration from the outset has centered in priests' liturgical "clubs," or "circles," functioning on a diocesan basis. Holland in 1946 held the First International Liturgical Week at Maastricht.

The liturgical movement suffered on its ceremonial side in England from its resemblance to the ritualism of the "Anglo-Catholics," and on its musical side the Briton's inclination to reserve makes itself felt. Since 1943 the English Liturgy Society has existed to create public opinion in favor of a wider use of the vernacular in Catholic offices of worship. The journal of this group, *The English Liturgist*, is a small but sturdy quarterly. The heritage of centuries of furtive, silent worship during penal times is a dead weight the Irishman of today cannot easily shake off. That initial practice of the liturgical movement, the Dialog Mass, had scarcely touched Ireland a few years back, in the judgment of Cardinal McRory then Primate. (The same effect is noticeable where priests from Irish seminaries set the local standards elsewhere, as in New Zealand and Australia.)

Germany, during the armistice of 1919-39, did more for liturgical studies, especially on the research level, than any other country. This work centered in the Rhineland Abbey of Maria Laach, under the late Abbot Herwegen. But the German movement was mixed with theoretical errors, tending to minimize the personal in overstressing the social (the old debate of "liturgical" versus "personal"); so Pius XII in writing to the bishops there distinguished between "what is wholesome and what is unwholesome." Similar tendencies are now condemned anew in the latest encyclical. The Fulda Bishops' Conference officially assumed direction of the movement: it has since secured papal approbation of a uniform and largely vernacular form for Dialog Mass and official acquiescence (*benignissime tolerari*) in the custom of having the people sing in German during High Mass (1944). A ritual, making wide use of the vernacular in other rites, was also worked out and sent to Rome for approbation.

Austria has been singularly blessed in producing the greatest popularizer of the liturgy of this century in the person of Pius Parsch, an Augustinian canon of Klosterneuburg near Vienna. Since the close of the first World War he has been the source of an incredible stream of publications, conferences, Liturgical Days, parochial activities. The Austrian bishops secured in 1935 the grant of using German (at the priest's option) in most rites exclusive of the Mass. All in all, the work of Pius Parsch touches the average Catholic of Austria in almost every contact with the Church.

France, where Dom Guéranger's monks of Solesmes had done the research behind the modern chant books, never quite succeeded in getting a widespread liturgical movement on a parish level prior to the late war. During the Resistance and the Liberation the sweet uses of adversity went far toward achieving just that. The claim was advanced in 1946 by Frenchmen that every parish in the land at last feels the quickening touch of this "new" liturgical movement. The French Dominican Fathers have let in the organization work, and their quarterly, *La Maison Dieu*, has leaped to the forefront of the literary battalion. The French bishops have petitioned Rome for a bilingual Ritual "like Austria's," for afternoon and evening Mass, etc. There has been spectacular experimentation with synchronized multiple Masses, such as that at the Paris Stadium in 1946 by the Cardinal-Archbishop and the 186 parish priests of the archdiocese. On occasion permission has been secured for Mass in French, the canon excepted. An eye-witness account of one such Mass may be of interest:

In many sections experiments were tried similar to the one I am about to describe, which I witnessed in the cathedral of Castres in November, 1944.

It was ten o'clock at night. The cathedral was already full of people, and the crowd overflowed into the street. The whole congregation was composed of workers brought there by their fellow-workers. A stage, erected on a level with the Communion rail, extended some distance down the main aisle of the church. As in the Middle Ages the sanctuaries were used for the presentation of religious plays, so tonight a great mystery was to be enacted in front of the altar.

All the actors were workers, wearing their work clothes. They moved forward into the glare of the spotlights. The drama began, concerning itself first with the shame of conquered France, its sufferings during the exodus which drove millions of its homeless people into the south, the misery of its prisoners held in Germany for five years, the horror of the bombardments. There, for two hours, the ordeals of a suffering people unfolded before the congregation. The organ music changed into a joyful melody when two carpenters brought to the stage a carpenter's work-bench. Next, weavers appeared, placing on this improvised altar three white linen cloths which they had themselves woven. Two miners took their

places on either side of the altar, with their lighted lamps like tapers, linking the world of labor with the worship of God. Lastly, came a printer, with a Missal he had printed especially for this occasion.

Then, Msgr. Moussaron, Archbishop of Albi, entered, garbed in his purple cassock. In full view of the congregation he was robed in his vestments while a priest explained their meaning. When midnight struck, the archbishop proceeded to the temporary altar and, facing the people, began the celebration of Mass. By special dispensation of the pope, this Mass, except for the Canon, was said in French. The effect on the congregation was instant and profound. For many it was as if they were hearing Mass for the first time. Numbers who had not practiced their religion for twenty or twenty-five years went to confession and received Holy Communion. The distribution of Communion lasted more than an hour. Three unbaptized workers, suddenly touched by divine grace, asked to receive the Holy Eucharist. Two years later when I returned to Castres, people were still talking about this ceremony, which had quickened for many a new view of Faith and a return to the obligations of a Christian.²

France's Iberian neighbors have their own quite different liturgical movement. That of Franco Spain is reflected in the newly established monthly, *Liturgia*, which was begun at the Toledo seminary and then transferred to the Benedictines of Silos. If France is very "advanced," Spain by contrast seems arch-conservative: the program thus far hardly goes beyond text study and Missal use. Portugal's movement has revived interest in Braga's ancient variant Latin Rite, and the Fatima occurrences have been accompanied by an enormous increase in Eucharistic devotion.

After the person of the Holy Father, it is that other great national hero, Cardinal Schuster, Archbishop of Milan, who dominates the Italian movement. It has sought, in north and south, by careful preparation and education, to enlarge the capacity and inclination of the man and woman of the congregation for a fuller corporate worship. It meets with no better than average success: "We are inclined to think," said Pius XII in 1943, "the faithful would not act in this manner, if they had a clear, deep and ardent concept of the Eucharistic Mystery."

Chile perhaps outstrips the other Latin-American nations in official episcopal guidance of the liturgical movement: the Joint Pastoral of its bishops in 1937 is one of the finest such yet produced. Brazil takes conspicuous part in a movement to restore Sunday Mass to honor, and the Mexican hierarchy set aside a full year (1938) for special liturgical instruction and an initiation into "liturgical" piety.

Canadian Catholics of French speech suffered a keen loss in this restoration of corporate worship in the death in 1947 of Cardinal Ville-

² Claude Julien, "Is France Catholic?" *Ave Maria*, 66, 5 (1947), pp. 135-39.

neuve, Archbishop of Quebec, who, over two decades and more, by writing, preaching, priests' conferences, and chancery regulations, took a leading role in the work. English-speaking Catholics of Canada have drawn upon the efforts being made in the United States to inaugurate a similar program of their own: a Maritime Liturgical Week was held at Charlottetown, P.E.I., in August, 1945.

Major developments in the United States could be briefly charted chronologically as follows. In 1918 Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, New York, established an institute that has grown into the Pius X School of Liturgical Music, which enjoys wide repute in training choirmasters and organists. *Orate Fratres*, a monthly journal published by the Benedictines of St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minnesota, began its apostolate with the Advent of 1925. The Liturgical Arts Society of New York was incorporated in 1932 for the multiple tasks of enlisting architecture and the other arts in the service of the sanctuary: its quarterly publication, *Liturgical Arts*, has consistently exerted a far-reaching influence in professional, artistic, and craft circles at home and abroad. Since 1940 the United States has had an annual Liturgical Week, the programs of which appear in yearbooks. A Catholic Choirmasters Correspondence Course, begun in 1942 in Pittsburgh, has evolved into The Gregorian Institute of America, Toledo, which now sponsors an ever-widening program of musical preparation for the day of those singing congregations.

The liturgical movement has progressed far enough to make many regard it as a mighty leaven in this one world we live in. Year by year it makes a stronger impact on non-Catholic Christianity. Denis de Rougemont³ after some years' residence in this country, was amazed to find the weight it pulls with postwar Protestants of Europe, and Dr. Cyril Richardson⁴ indicates how far some in this country are prepared to go, in approximating the Mass, in the ecumenical worship of the future.

³ Denis de Rougemont, "A Common Language," *Christendom*, 12, 3 (1947), 290-98.

⁴ Cyril C. Richardson, "Towards an Ecumenical Worship," *Christendom*, 12, 4 (1947), 443-46.

The Doctrine of the Remnant

C. K. MAHONEY

*Does the doctrine of limited redemption, so true to history,
apply also to man's future in this world
and the next?*

IT IS INTERESTING to observe that old styles in garments return and become the latest fashion. It is even more interesting to discover that an ancient philosophy may find itself restated in terms of a fresh and striking world view or philosophic method. Doctrines that are hoary with age may find expression, directly or indirectly, in modes of thought that claim to be new and original. It ill behooves us, in our modern desire to relate our thinking to the latest discoveries and to apply it directly to contemporary needs, to neglect the wisdom of the ancients. We can still learn from men who lived and thought and dreamed long ago.

One of the ancient doctrines which in some quarters has had a new vogue is the doctrine of the Remnant. Modern religious thinking will do well to give the doctrine a fuller study. Such study will probably be very fruitful indeed in its bearing on the question of universal salvation especially in this present world; but as the study progresses, it will be seen to throw light upon the question of universal salvation in any context.

The doctrine of a remnant of God's people, faithful and redeemed, is found throughout the writings of the Old Testament. It is especially marked in the Prophets Amos, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Micah, and Deutero-Isaiah. The distinguished Cambridge scholar, Dr. T. W. Manson, has a good statement of the development of the doctrine:

Originally the relation between Jehovah and Israel is simply conceived. Israel is the people of his inheritance: and what is required of them is exclusive loyalty to him and obedience to him in *torah* and prophecy. On Jehovah's part it is understood that he will make Israel the special object of his favor and secure them in the possession of their land. . . . As the standard of loyalty and obedience is raised, the number of people who may be expected to attain it decreases. It ceases to be an ideal for the nation and becomes an ideal for an elect few within the nation.¹

This author goes on to develop the thesis that the key to the teaching of Jesus is the prophetic notion of the remnant; that the "Son of Man"

¹ *The Teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge University Press, 1931, p. 175.

in his teaching represents Jesus' formulation of the remnant ideal; and that he is the Son of Man by embodying that ideal in his own person.

The doctrine of the remnant might be called the doctrine of a limited redemption. In some of the prophets this saving of a fragment of the nation is clearly understood and generally accepted. In the first outburst of jubilation over the deliverance of Israel from captivity the great prophet who sings of the exile, referred to by scholars as Deutero-Isaiah (Chapters 40 to 66—in whole or in part), seems to sound a note of universality and completeness: "*Every* valley shall be exalted, and *every* mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain: and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and *all* flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." But almost immediately he stresses the transiency of human life and the frailty of the race, and later he seems to scale down his expectation of the restoration of Israel; the doctrine of a remnant comes to clear and emphatic statement. His doctrine of a universal God is without retraction or modification from first to last. Also the call of the Lord is to all his people. But to the fulfillment of the dream of restoration, a limit is set. Restoration is for the seed of a new Israel, not for the whole of the old Israel.

There was indeed a fulfillment. Just as with a handful of exceptions, the carcasses of the generation coming out of Egypt were left scattered in the wilderness and a new generation moved into the land of promise, so the undesirable were weeded out from among the captives who were to return from Babylon to Jerusalem. Someone has remarked that the people of Israel went into captivity a nation and came out a church. Yet the ideals of the prophet were not fulfilled with any degree of completeness. The glories of which he sang were only faintly and partly realized. But that did not invalidate his message. It was a message of comfort and inspiration and it served its purpose. Its prediction was an idealization amounting to hyperbole. Plain facts generally fall short of poetic imagination. The remnant was even smaller than the picture of it in the prophecy.²

Over against the doctrine of the remnant, in various literatures and languages, is the optimistic faith in a universal redemption for humanity. This belief is assumed to be corollary to faith in the goodness and love of God. It is based upon such a faith. It is an ancient doctrine, but is about as clearly stated in a recent book as it has ever been stated:

² Driver, S. R., *The Ideals of the Prophets*. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1915.

Without the ultimate salvation of all creatures, man and, we think, animals, in God's time and way, it is easy to see that there can be no full solution of the problem of evil. Even if the "evil" perish, there is loss and shortcoming in God's work. There is waste of the creative life of God. If there were an eternal hell, God's love would, of course, unquestionably be finite. Traditionalistic theology has proclaimed either an evil or a finite God. We still must have a worthy view of God.³

This is a statement of universal redemption. The goodness and love of God cannot fail in reaching the last sinner somewhere, sometime, in history or beyond history. The sanctity and rectitude of the divine character require it. Omnipotent love cannot ultimately be defeated.

Other statements of the case are found in the religious philosophy of romanticism that sees no great evil in man's sin and no problem in his redemption. Still another romantic philosophy would overthrow the moral law and regard might as right. According to this teaching, the Superman will be realized through man's sheer self-assertion. Any consciousness of sin or any repentance is regarded as sentimental weakness. This teaching does not hold that all men on the earth will ultimately find salvation, but that only the mighty will be left on the earth. A race of supermen "beyond good and evil" will be the culmination of human evolution.

The latter doctrine deserves little consideration from religious people. It is not generally regarded as a religious philosophy; and when it undertakes to assume that it is, its sincerity is open to question. But the former is deeply rooted in genuinely religious motivation. It grows out of the agony in the souls of men who have grappled with the most difficult problem that honest and earnest thinkers have ever had to confront. Such men deserve to be heard with patience and understanding.

But they need to be reminded, that God's willingness to accomplish the complete and universal redemption of the human race is not the question at issue. In the face of all the facts, a believer in God can still maintain that God is *willing* for the redemption of all mankind:

For the love of God is broader
Than the measure of man's mind,
And the heart of the Eternal
Is most wonderfully kind.

Nor is the *adequacy* of God's power to accomplish that redemption in question. Of course, God's power is limited by the fact of human free-

³ Ferré, Nels F. S., *Evil and the Christian Faith*. Harper & Brothers, 1947, p. 117.

dom, whether we grant that man's freedom is a gift from God for the sake of the development of moral personality or whether we believe that man's freedom is a part of the inherent structure of a universe of process. But God's power is adequate for the redemption of any man who wishes to be redeemed. Unless man has the power to refuse redemption at God's hands, human freedom is an unreality, an illusional farce. One might as well go over to the epiphenomenalism of the materialist, in so far as human freedom is concerned.

The main question is the question of man's response. What is the guarantee in a moral world of human freedom that all men of their own volition will ultimately turn to God? It may be that they will. The doctrine that a deadline is fixed somewhere in the course of man's life, either in this life or another, beyond which he would not be accepted into his Father's house, is not the necessary alternative to the doctrine of ultimate universal redemption. When we assume, however, that all men are under a law of destiny that will ultimately constrain them to turn to God, we make an assumption that is unprovable. The best that we can assume is the possibility of such a turning. In this connection we may raise another question: If, for the sake of giving man moral freedom to develop a spiritual life of devotion to that which is highest and best, the matter of his redemption is left in temporary abeyance, what is our assurance that all men ultimately will turn to that which is highest and best? For that matter, what assurance did God have that any man ever would? If we say that the outcome was never in doubt, we take away the reality of the venture. Then we must say, once again, that man's freedom is illusory. Ultimately, man must will to be good in order to make himself amenable to redemption.

As we behold the world of mankind in action, the prospect for universal redemption is not encouraging. Especially is it so at this juncture of history. And as we study man's moral responses as far back as history permits us to go, the picture is pretty much the same, worse at some periods and better at others. We are tempted to agree with Machiavelli, who furnished in his own life a clear illustration of his view, that "Man is poor stuff." And such transactions as those at Belsen and Buchenwald support his contention. It would seem, as we study the picture, that man has had a greater affinity for evil than for good. In fact, the assertion that all men have missed and come short of the glory of God is an unquestionable statement of fact. At least no deeply religious man would care to question it.

At once it will be said that man's own responses cannot alone account for his redemption, that the pressure of the Eternal must come in upon him, that the power of God is the supreme potency in all human redemption. Admittedly this is so. But the power of God does not coerce man to be good. That man is a creature of response, always moved by a stimulus, is sound doctrine, borne out in experience and scientifically attested. But the power of response is man's power. However, the response rather than the stimulus is finally determinative. Before the soul of man can be redeemed, he must repent of his sins. He must assume right voluntary attitudes. From within he must be brought to direct himself toward the highest and best.

Dean Inge is such a thoroughgoing realist that he has been called a pessimist, but he has apparently not flinched from the disagreeable. Some years ago he made a strong assertion:

The strength of Christianity is in transforming the lives of individuals—of a small minority, certainly, as Christ clearly predicted, but a large number in the aggregate. To rescue a little flock, here and there, from materialism, selfishness, and hatred, is the task of the Church of Christ in all ages alike, and there is no likelihood that it will ever be otherwise.⁴

This is the doctrine of the remnant in very incisive terms. What Dean Inge says concerning the accomplishments of Christianity in the past is undoubtedly true. In the first years of its history the Christian movement was exceedingly limited and very obscure. Jesus did come into the world to set up a spiritual empire of world-wide dimensions but he went out of the world without having taken a single city. He had gathered only a handful of followers that faced a hostile world with fear and trembling. One of the most phenomenal of all facts of history has been the growth of the power of the Man of Nazareth. He has become the greatest of all world figures. His influence has spilled over into most of the religions of the world. His ideas have changed the thought systems of mankind in such a way that there can be no return to former standpoints. But Christianity is yet a minority religion. The followers of Christ, all taken together, consist of only a small fraction of the population of the earth.

And when one seeks to penetrate the community of Christian life and thought, he comes to the conclusion that the New Testament impact has been limited almost to the point of superficiality. Jesus recognized a lack of thoroughness in his own first disciples. That lack of thorough-

⁴ *Science, Religion and Reality*. The Macmillan Company, 1925, p. 388.

ness is still in evidence in the Christian movement. The professedly Christian portion of the world population is a decided minority and the recognizedly genuine portion of the Christian community, showing understanding of Christian ideas and devotion to Christian principles, is small indeed. As one reflects on the fewness of the real saints that he has contacted, he becomes increasingly impressed with the pertinence of Dean Inge's observation. Indeed all that Christianity has ever been able to do has been to work the redemption of a minor fraction of the human race. What it may yet be able to do remains to be seen.

But his final prediction is admittedly open to question, possibly to refutation. It is the business of science to make predictions in the realm of natural facts. But science has great difficulty in doing that. Science is not fond of setting the line of impossibility. It is reported that a few weeks before the Wright Brothers made their experimental flight, a conclave of scientists met in a certain American city and made the pronouncement that no body heavier than air ever would be able to rise in the air. Of course, the flight of the Wright Brothers, and all that has taken place in aeronautical history since that time, has been a refutation of that pronouncement. Religion must not be more reckless than science in making predictions.

It just might be possible that unforeseeable marvels will take place in evangelization and in the conversion of the world to saving religion. It would seem that there is yet opportunity for the world to become much more widely and thoroughly Christian than it is. Conceivably a Christian civilization might even be established; and such an achievement might belong to this world, this present world. Christianity in history might indeed become a far more thoroughly recognized fact on a world basis. Such a culmination is not an impossible dream or an unreasonable hope.

But as one pursues this line of thinking and squarely confronts the unlimited possibilities belonging to the coming of the Kingdom of God, he is not using appropriate critical caution unless he raises the question why anyone has a right to expect that human nature will so change with the processes of time that men's responses to the call of God will be different after a thousand years from what they have been through the thousand years of the past. Should we expect the old temptations to disappear? And if conditions should greatly improve, what assurance have we that the responses of men to the moving of God will ever reach the point of perfection? Possibility remains possibility and carries no

warrant of realistic fulfillment. When we admit that, we give the doctrine of the remnant a range of significance that may extend into the farthest reaches of eternity.

But the man from Missouri will remain cautious. He will wish to see the evidence. Realistic religion will undertake to look with candor on the past and will hold an attitude of faith toward the future, but it will be a cautious faith. There will be no indulgence in extravagant dreaming, no sentimental exuberance that takes things for granted.

The problem of evil is not solved by the assumptions of any kind of universalism. These assumptions themselves must have confirmation from experience. That must come in the distant future, if at all. Dr. Ferré has written of his wrestle with that difficult problem. The fact that he has seen that it is tremendous gives testimony of his deep understanding of spiritual things and his philosophical acumen. But even his keen mind is unequal to the problem of evil. Nobody has ever found a solution. To say that there never will be a solution is beyond present logical requirements, but all that we need say now is that there is as yet no solution. Yet the honest and realistic thinker must perpetually feel under obligation to go as far as he can toward solving it. If we had the solution, we would probably be close to an understanding of the Infinite God.

But this line of thinking does raise a question for realistic religion that is neither speculative nor unanswerable. That is the question of whether a limited and partial redemption of the human race would be a worthy Christian ideal if that ideal were to be regarded as the limit of Christian possibility. Suppose that Dean Inge is right. What then? There are those who would feel that if Christianity could not realize all its aims in all their fullness, it must be pronounced a failure. There are others who would assert that the genuine redemption of one soul would be worth all the sacrifice of Christ on the cross and all the suffering of the Christian martyrs through the centuries. But the hard-headed realist will answer that the results are far greater than the saving of one soul, that Christianity has wrought the redemption of many souls, that it has made of the world a better world than could ever have existed without it, and that it holds immeasurable possibilities for the future redemption of man and betterment of society. Such a realist will tell us to let the Christian religion do its work as it can, let it accomplish all that it can in a world so sorely in need of its service.

Sometimes religion is at low tide and sometimes it is at high tide.

In the decade prior to the first World War one heard such slogans as "The world for Christ in this generation!" Religion was then at high tide. But something was wrong with the outlook. The world has never been so fully evangelized as some enthusiastic Christians have imagined it might be. Even in those days of exuberant idealism there were a good many materialists, to say nothing of those persons whose motives were low and vicious. The world was very far from the Kingdom of God.

Realistic religion must calm down the enthusiast who shouts forth the dawn of the Millennium. At the same time, it must look with clear eyes upon Christianity's achievements. The Christian movement has been a mighty movement of spiritual advance. There are those who speak of the failure of Christianity. They say that a religion of real power should have acquired wider acceptance in the last two thousand years. But two thousand years is a short time on a cosmic scale. And Christianity has produced genuine saints in every generation of its history. Not only has it produced saints but it has produced moral and spiritual heroes. As previously suggested, these are comparatively few and exceptional when seen over against the masses of mankind; but the quality of their lives has had a genuineness that has established a pattern for high and holy living. And the power of the Christian religion is not diminishing. It is growing, and the gates of hell cannot prevail against it.

Can any earnest adherent of a faith to which he has devoted his life, and which he sees as a way of salvation for the whole world, reconcile himself to a mere remnant as the result of Christian evangelism? He should never be content with any but the fullest possible response. He cannot be content, and have a genuine passion for the spread of righteousness and truth and for the coming of the Kingdom of God in the world in all its fullness. He must strive to make the remnant ever larger. He must remember that this has been the lot of the prophets and saints in all ages. They have died, not having received the promise, but they have felt it worth while to invest their lives in whatever spiritual progress might be possible.

One might easily fall into a deadly error at this point. He might give himself over to pietistic complacency. He might adopt a "slow and gradual" philosophy of Christian progress. This is fatal. The evils of the world are too gigantic to overcome with gentle methods. The needs of humanity are too pressing to be met with anything less than a passionate devotion to doing all that can be done for the race. It

is the steady pressure of an agelong crusade that will make religion effective in saving the remnant of the people of the world.

How far can we go in the effort to produce Christians? There are doubtless those who would say that we should put no limits on our efforts. But we cannot resort to force. Nor can we use deceit and subterfuge. There is a point in persuasion beyond which we cannot go and still command respect for that which we are presenting. We greatly err when we cross the line between friendly concern and presumption. We must remember that no man is redeemed until he subjectively and voluntarily changes his attitudes. Mere assent in the world of the spirit is insufficient. A person has not become genuinely converted until he has acted for himself upon the grounds of his own motivation. In the last analysis, about all you can do is to seek properly and clearly and effectively to present the case of your religion. Beyond that you cannot go. When you have done that, all you can do is to leave the case with him and with God.

If one recognizes the validity and force of the doctrine of the remnant as applying to religious progress up to the present, he may also be allowed to assume that there is no limit set to the possibilities of the future. There is no law of necessity guaranteeing a mere remnant. This is a world of becoming. It is also a world of contingency. The future may produce an utterly different world. In fact, the processes of history have been doing just that. Among the possibilities of the future is the possibility that all the people of some coming generation may turn unto God. This is a practical possibility. About the best that we can do with the problem of the millions now gone from the earth is to commit them to the Divine mercy.

But one can also thank God for the remnant that in every age turned toward God and faithfully sought to bring in his Kingdom. The remnant is the glorious fruit of redemptive effort. The persons constituting the remnant are the "elect" of God. They are the rare and radiant aristocracy of spiritual progress. The minority in history has been a preservative force in the life of mankind. Whether as an internal or an external proletariat struggling against a decadent civilization for a new order of existence, or as a "dominant minority" that seeks to preserve its control in such a state of civilization, or as a creative minority that is building a brave new world, the minority has ever been more powerful and more significant than the majority. The remnant is that minority which stands with God.

Marriage and Love in Christian History

ROLAND H. BAINTON

Three principal views of marriage have emerged in Christian history—each has its own value, but an ideal union would combine them all.

MARRIAGE HAS always been defended by the Christian church against those religions which regard life in the flesh as an imprisonment, death as a release, and marriage as an evil because perpetuating the captivity of souls. Christian marriage is monogamous, exclusive for both partners—there is no double standard—and lifelong. But these essentials still leave room for considerable diversity of application in details, and Christian attitudes to marriage have exhibited varieties of emphasis. Three main types have emerged.

The first and most prevalent is the sacramental view of marriage, according to which it is a sacrament of the church. The primary purpose is to have children. A secondary object is to keep passion within bounds. The relationship is for life, and divorce if allowed is only for adultery. The consent of the partners is necessary, but there is no need that they be in love. At this point the romantic view takes issue with the sacramental. The prerequisite for marriage is to have fallen in love. The corollary need not be that if romance cease, marriage is terminated, though in practice this has sometimes been the inference. The romantic view makes for the refinement of marriage but also for instability. The third view may be called the companionable. It holds that marriage is for more than progeny and the restraint of passion. It is also for comradeship between husband and wife based on a community of interests and tastes. This view likewise makes for refinement, though it may also produce instability if an alteration in tastes is regarded as a sufficient ground for the dissolution of marriage. These three positions—the sacramental, the romantic, and the companionable—are not mutually exclusive. In an ideal union all three are present. But throughout the Christian centuries, now one and now another has been exalted to the disparagement of the rest.

I

The first and most persistent type is the sacramental. It is better grounded than the other two in the New Testament. Jesus declared

that marriage was instituted by God as a lifelong relationship. "From the beginning . . . male and female made he them. For this cause a man . . . shall cleave to his wife. . . . What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."¹ Divorce was introduced by Moses because of the hardness of men's hearts. Matthew's Gospel says that it is permissible but only on account of adultery.² St. Paul compared marriage to the relationship of Christ and the church and added, "This is a great mystery." The word "mystery" in the Latin version was rendered "sacrament."³ But because Paul believed that the present order of life on earth would speedily be displaced through the coming of the Lord, he urged those who were unmarried to remain as they were. If, however, they could not contain themselves marriage was allowed as a concession.⁴ Finally Jesus himself sanctified marriage by attending the wedding at Cana.⁵ On the basis of these passages the church teaches that marriage is ordained of God, it is binding for life.

Marriage is a sacrament; at the same time it is somewhat of a concession. Marriage is thus both exalted and disparaged. This picture scarcely leaves room for any romantic interpretation. For such an attitude one must turn from the New Testament to the Old, to the Song of Songs, or to the story of Jacob's love for Rachel. Neither does the New Testament offer much with regard to companionability in marriage. Husbands and wives are of course to love each other, but only in the case of Prisca and Aquila do we have a record of partnership in religious activity.

The ideals of the New Testament found their first application and development in the environment of the Greco-Roman urban society where older and stricter mores had broken down through wars, travel, and luxury. Among some in pagan society the reaction against the prevalent immorality was so strong as to lead to the repudiation of marriage altogether. The church then found herself at once the defender of marriage and the upholder of morality. Against the detractors the church was led to define the main purpose of marriage as the bearing of children. The proof text was found not in the New Testament but in the words of the Lord to Adam and Eve, "Be fruitful and multiply."⁶ One of the early fathers declared that nature has adapted us for marriage because we have been created male and female. The childless fail in the perfec-

¹ Mark 10:2-11.

² Matt. 19:3-9.

³ Eph. 5:22f.

⁴ I Cor. 7:8-9.

⁵ John 2:1-11.

⁶ Gen. 1:28.

tion which is according to nature in that they do not provide for themselves successors. Man is further obligated to provide citizens for the state and to complete the perfection of the world. Moreover, children are the best insurance for old age. Propagation then is the main purpose of marriage.

If that were the only purpose, however, polygamy would not be excluded; and the fathers were perplexed on this score because they admired the patriarchs of the Old Testament who were polygamists. The usual explanation was that polygamy had been allowed at first in order the more rapidly to people the empty earth, but that this expedient was now no longer needful. God signified at the outset that he did not intend polygamy to be a permanent institution, because in making a wife for Adam he utilized only *one* rib. As a matter of fact, monogamy had become prevalent in Judaism long before the Christian era and was simply taken for granted by Christians.

The church in defining the true end and purpose of marriage did not hesitate to differ from the state. The Roman law recognized two forms of union, the one called marriage, the other concubinage. Only those of the same social rank could marry, the free with the free, the slave with the slave. The free could marry a slave only by renouncing freedom. A union, however, could be contracted by a free person with a slave on the basis not of marriage but of concubinage, and such a relationship might be monogamous and lifelong. This legal situation created for the church a problem, because the free women within the fellowship outnumbered the men. The church discouraged marriage with unbelievers. The free women were reluctant to forfeit their status by marrying the slave men. The church in the third century solved the problem by ruling that a union which in the eyes of the state was concubinage would in the eyes of the church rate as marriage. Thus began a difference between church law and civil law, emphasizing that for the church the essentials were that the union should be monogamous, lifelong, and for the sake of children. Here we have fully developed the sacramental view.

The church was ever at pains to maintain the stability of marriage by offering sage counsel on how to avoid and overcome dissension between married couples. St. Chrysostom advises that a wife should never say to her husband:

"Unmanly coward and lazy sluggard, look at that man. He is of low birth, but he runs risks, undertakes voyages and has made a fortune. His wife wears jewels and goes out with a pair of milk-white mules. She is attended by a troop of

slaves, but you have cowered down and live to no purpose." But if a wife does so speak, her husband shall say to her: "My dear, when I could have taken many to wife, both with better fortunes and of noble family, I did not so choose but was enamoured of you and your beautiful life, your modesty, your gentleness and soberness of mind." Then immediately from these beginnings the husband shall open the way to a discourse on true wisdom with some circumlocutions on the vanity of riches.⁷

From such counsels the step was not far to recognizing in marriage a secondary purpose in the fellowship of the partners. One of the early writers declared that friendship has a more excellent quality when based upon a diversity of sex. Another leader provided a picture of companionship in marriage. Husband and wife, he declared, are not only one flesh but one spirit:

. . . together they pray, together they fast, mutually teaching, exhorting and sustaining. Equally they are in the church of God and at the banquet of God, equally in persecutions and refreshments. Neither hides anything from the other, shuns the other, or molests the other. They share in visiting the sick and relieving the needy. Between them echo Psalms and hymns and they vie with each other in chanting to the Lord.⁸

But of the romantic picture of love and marriage in the early Christian literature there is not a trace. The fear of immorality was so great that an erotic note in marriage was sharply discountenanced. Women were strongly exhorted not to make themselves attractive. The reason was in part to avoid sexual appeal, in part to be disciplined for the ordeal of martyrdom. "Will the neck which wears a necklace," exclaimed Tertullian, "bow before the axe of the executioner? . . . Clothe yourself then with the silk of uprightness, the fine linen of holiness, and the purple of modesty. Thus painted you will have God as your lover."⁹

Any tendency toward a romantic picture of marriage was all the more disparaged because of the growing spirit of asceticism in the church. Whereas the Apostle Paul had recommended that the unmarried remain as they were because of the shortness of the time, subsequent generations came to exalt virginity as superior to marriage on grounds of purity and heroism. A distinction early arose between the precepts of the gospel intended for all Christians and the counsels of perfection directed only to the more hardy. The perfect way called for poverty, pacifism, and celibacy. Those who in the early church dedicated themselves to virginity were held in high esteem. All such tendencies were greatly enhanced by the monastic movement; although the monks never rejected marriage for

⁷ Post-Nicene Fathers, ser. 2, XIII, 149-51.

⁸ Tertullian, "To His Wife," II, 8. Ante-Nicene Fathers, IV, 48.

⁹ Tertullian, "On the Appeal of Women," 213. Ante-Nicene Fathers, IV, 25.

all Christians, yet they did their best to relegate marriage to a second place. St. Jerome painted luridly all the difficulties of matrimony. A wife is distracted by caring for children, superintending cooks and weavers. "The message comes that her husband is bringing guests, she flutters about. Is the sofa smooth? Is the pavement swept? Are the flowers in the vases? Is the dinner ready? Where amid all this is there room for any thought of God?" "The church nevertheless," said Jerome, "does not condemn marriage but only subordinates it." "Marriage is good because it produces virgins." Jerome did not condemn marriage, yet saw signs of God's displeasure in that only the unclean animals walked into the ark two by two, and God himself refrained from pronouncing a blessing on the second day of creation because the number two prefigures marriage.¹⁰ The views of Jerome were unquestionably extreme.

A more moderate position was taken by the first great formulator of Catholic ethics, St. Augustine. He was influenced by his own experience. For sixteen years he had had a monogamous union on the level of concubinage with a woman below him in social status. In his Catholic period he reproached himself not with the lack of the legal sanction of marriage, but that in so many years but one child had been born. The reason was that he had belonged to the Manichees, who condemned propagation as the imprisonment of souls but condoned sexual relations without issue as a concession to the flesh. Obviously they practiced birth control. After his conversion Augustine was for a time a monk. He was not for that reason any less stalwart in his defense of marriage against the Manichees. Marriage, said Augustine, is good. Sex as such is not evil. But the purpose of sex is propagation and anything in excess of that intent is evil. It is an evil, however, from which no married couple is ever free. The sin is in a measure covered by the sacrament. That which outside of marriage is a mortal sin, within marriage is but a venial sin, provided no artificial device is used to prevent offspring. Here we have the first clear formulation of the Catholic ethic as to birth control. Augustine was quoted in the most recent papal encyclical on the subject. Unfortunately Catholics still talk as if they were refuting Manichees, and fail to recognize that the purpose of birth control among non-Catholic Christians is not to have no families but to space and limit the number of children.

Augustine, like his predecessors, both defended and disparaged marriage. He thought the ideal relationship within marriage would be

¹⁰ Ante-Nicene Fathers, VI, 29-30, 71, 77, 345.

complete continence and was not disturbed by the prospect of a childless world, for in that case the City of God would be more speedily complete. He commended friendship in marriage, especially on a level above sex, but exhibited never a trace of the romantic.

II

The nonromantic aspects of marriage were accentuated in the early Middle Ages because urban culture was displaced by an agrarian economy. In a society built on land, marriage became an important institution for conserving and enlarging estates. Likewise in a world of small political units marriage served as a device for cementing alliances. Matrimony then became an affair of families and dynasties. Unions were not to be enforced without the consent, but they were certainly contracted without consulting the wishes of the partners. Obviously this was true when engagements took place in infancy. The daughter of Roger of Sicily was betrothed as a child in 1095. Adelheid was eight when betrothed to Henry V of England in 1110. Gertrud was twelve when in 1127 she was engaged to Henry of Bavaria. Louis of France in 1158 betrothed his daughter while in the cradle to the three-year-old son of Henry of England. In 1207 the son of the Duke of Brabant was only just born when betrothed to the daughter of Philip of Swabia. Marriages also were consummated at an early age in Germany in the late Middle Ages. The average age for girls was from thirteen to fifteen years, and for boys from fifteen to nineteen. Among the Wittelsbachs and Hohenzollerns in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries many instances are recorded of marriages at the age of twelve and thirteen years. In a word, the Christian Middle Ages had the system of family marriages still prevalent in India and China. This is not to say that marriage was a yoke of bondage or a vale of tears. Families no doubt had some eye to the suitability of partners who after marriage might become attached to each other, but the atmosphere was not romantic.

The less so because the rulers of the church took no account of the feelings of the partners. When Lothair I deserted his wife in favor of his concubine, the church insisted that he return. He thereupon made life so unbearable for his wife that she was ready to resort to extreme expedients to be rid of him. But the church ruled that she must endure martyrdom rather than suffer him to live with his concubine. In other instances unions were dissolved with similar unconcern for feelings. The church forbade marriage up to the seventh degree of relationship, though

some held that six degrees of consanguinity would suffice because God made the world in six days and rested on the seventh. In any case one could not marry a sixth cousin. In addition there were bonds of spiritual relationship. A godparent at baptism became related to a godchild and the relatives of the one to the relatives of the other. These restrictions could be relaxed through dispensations granted by the church. The system commended itself to the church as the device for controlling the marriages especially of royal houses; and the populace accepted the system because it provided a substitute for divorce, since if any flaw were discovered in the original dispensation the marriage could be annulled. These manipulations had no regard for romantic attachments. Robert the Pious, after living happily for some years with his wife Bertha, was discovered to be related to her physically as fourth cousin and spiritually as godfather to her child by a previous marriage. Against the wishes of both partners the union was ruthlessly dissolved.

During the Middle Ages, as before, marriage was both defended and disparaged. The doctors of the church all said that marriage is good and is no impediment to salvation nor even to sainthood. Thomas More, recently canonized, was a married man, but virginity was exalted as a superior way. Very popular were the stories of saints like Alexius, who forsook his bride at the altar to go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Returning, he lived unrecognized as a beggar beneath his father's doorstep and unrecognized related to his abandoned bride the holy exploits of her bridegroom. The enforcement of clerical celibacy in the eleventh century likewise served to stigmatize marriage as of inferior sanctity. The laity were exhorted to refuse to accept the mass at the hands of the married priests. Celibacy was of course not enjoined upon the laity, but married couples were enjoined to abstain from relations on holy days.

Against these attitudes of the church came revolt in two directions. The time and the place were the same, southern France in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The one rejected marriage in favor of continence for all, or at least for the elect. This was the revival of the Manichean view among people who were called Cathari or Albigenses. The other revolt was in favor of courtly love, the cult of romance. The historical specialists are agreed that the ideal of courtly love was something altogether new. This of course is not to say that people had never before fallen in love. What of the passion of Paris for Helen, or the languishing of Dido, not to mention Ovid's *Art of Love*? But love in these in-

stances was considered an enslaving passion, if not an occasion for levity. Courtly love on the contrary was portrayed as ennobling, because the beloved is superior to the lover and conveys to him something of her own worth. Here for the first time we have not only a cult of love but also the idealization of woman. The love which ennoble must be freely bestowed and the quality of unconstraint is best exhibited if the beloved is superior to the lover. On his part there is required a humility which never takes success for granted, a constant yearning and striving after love. Courtly love called for continual courtship and courtesy.

The three conditions of this love are exhibited in Troubadour song. The first is that love ennoble. "Love is not a sin," sang one of the Troubadours, "Rather it is a power that makes the evil good and by it the good become better." Secondly, the beloved must be superior to the lover. "The lady of whom you hear me sing is fairer than I can say; fresh complexioned, beautiful to look upon, without blemish. Yes, and she is not rouged, nor can anyone say evil of her, so pure and noble is she." "She is lovely, gay and slender; never was there seen a more charming person, so pure and noble is she." The lover is her inferior and her vassal. "Lady, I am and shall be yours, ready for your service. I am your sworn and pledged vassal." In the third place love must be a quest ever uncertain. "So fearful am I in regard to her, the fair one, that I deliver myself to her, imploring her mercy." Jealousy is "the mother and nurse of love," in the sense of solicitude, anxiety, and vehemence of desire.

This love was held to be impossible in marriage, because in marriage love is taken for granted, not freely given. In marriage woman is not the superior but the equal if not indeed the inferior of man. In marriage there is no exhilarating quest, no furtive fulfillment. The conditions of courtly love are best realized if the lover address himself to a married woman on whom he has less than a claim and whom he cannot enjoy without stealth and adventure. Hence courtly love became the cult of adultery.

In real life we discover the conflict of virginity, marriage, and courtly love in the case of Abelard and Eloise. He was a distinguished teacher who won the love of a young and brilliant girl. They had a child out of wedlock. Abelard, who had violated the hospitality of her uncle, offered to make amends by marriage. Eloise was the one to object. Her scale of values reveals the conflicting currents of the age. In the first rank she placed virginity. Abelard had already taken lower

orders in the church looking toward ordination and celibacy. He had fallen from this high ideal, but should return rather than that they should continue in sin. But if not, she would rather be his mistress than his wife. The reason was partly economic. As a teacher he could not support a wife and family and continue his career, because universities in those days were not endowed to support married professors. But the most serious consideration was that marriage was a yoke of bondage for the wife and a device for uniting properties. "I want not yours but you. I invoke God as witness that if Augustus should offer to make me his empress I would rather be your mistress." They did marry, presumably to satisfy Abelard's debt of honor, but the scale of values remained: virginity first, courtly love second, and marriage third.

Thus far, courtly love does not belong in the discussion of Christian attitudes to marriage. But in the age of the Renaissance a combination was effected in that marriage was romanticized. The wife was idealized. The first practical question was what young people should do if they fell in love. The answer was that they should not engage in illicit relations but should get married. The next stage was the view that in order to get married they must first have fallen in love. Thus romance became a prerequisite for marriage. One discovers the restrictions of romance to marriage and subsequently the romanticizing of marriage among some of the Italian humanists, in Germany in the work of Von Eyb, and in England notably in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. This view has become increasingly prevalent in modern times, but often with the unhappy and unnecessary corollary that if romantic attachment wanes marriage should be terminated.

III

The sacramental view of marriage, then, was developed in the early church and the Middle Ages. The romantic picture came with the Renaissance. The Reformation was chiefly responsible for the development of the third type, companionability in marriage. This note of course had not been altogether absent hitherto, but the emphasis was now notably developed.

The first step was to dethrone virginity from a place of superiority. This was the work of Martin Luther. His point of departure was not a repudiation of virginity but a rejection of the distinction between the universal precepts of the gospel and the counsels of perfection. According to Luther there is no higher righteousness. All Christians are

enjoined to be perfect even though none succeeds. Differences of vocation of course exist, but one is not superior to another. Some may be married and some unmarried, but one does not excel the other in virtue. Luther himself married chiefly to exemplify his teaching. There was no romance about it. "I am not madly in love," said he, "but I esteem my wife"; and again, "I would not exchange my Katie for France and Venice because God has given her to me and other women have worse faults." In his rejection of the superiority of virginity Luther for a time laid great stress on the necessity and rectitude of the physical side of sex. By an undue emphasis he tended to coarsen the relationship. He contended that marriage is not a sacrament, not because he repudiated the essentially sacramental character, but because a sacrament must be peculiar to Christianity, whereas marriage is valid even among the Turks. Luther still treated marriage as a rite of the church, but he opened the door toward regarding it as a civil contract depending upon the inclinations of the contracting parties.

The chief progress toward the view of marriage as companionability came with the more radical Protestant sects. Puritanism, often credited with the extinction of delights of natural life, has done more than any other movement for the refinement of marriage. The emphasis for the Puritan was certainly not on sex as primary in marriage, as Luther had been disposed to make it. The Puritan agreed with the Catholic that marriage is primarily for progeny and that sex for any other reason should be discouraged. Neither was the emphasis primarily on love between the partners. Love itself must be kept within bounds because love is subordinate to loyalty to God. A Puritan wrote to his sweetheart:

My Dove, I send you not my heart, for that I trust is sent to Heaven long since, and unless it hath wofully deceived me, it hath not taken up its lodgings in any one's bosom on this side of the Royal City of the Great King, but yet most of it that is allowed to be layed out upon any creature doth safely and singly fall to your share.¹¹

Is not this quaint missive another way of saying that love itself must rest upon a common loyalty and mutuality of conviction?

These in turn found their expression in common activities in the rearing of children in the fear of the Lord and in the joint management of household affairs. Especially among the more radical sects, the Anabaptists and Quakers, the equality was more complete because of the rejection of the ancient Pauline injunction that women should be silent

¹¹ Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family*, 1944, p. 16.

in church. In the meetings of Friends the women spoke equally with the men and both engaged in missionary tours. They were willing even to forego the physical presence in order to aid the joint endeavor. Margaret Fox wrote of her husband:

Though the Lord had provided an outward habitation for him we were very willing both of us to live apart for some years on God's account and His truth's service, and to deny ourselves of that comfort which we might have had in being together for the sake and service of the Lord and His truth.¹²

The Puritan concept has altered not only the concept of marriage but of relations of the sexes in general, and that camaraderie which Continentals remark as peculiarly British is the fruit of Puritanism, which by putting God first has enabled men and women to labor together without consciousness of their biological differences.

At times the Puritan approach sounds all too unsentimental and utterly unromantic. Puritans ordinarily would not marry because they had fallen in love. They fell in love because they were married. Occasionally they appear all too dutiful about it, as when John Knox referred to his fiancée as "she whom God hath offered to me and commanded me to love as my own flesh." But Knox was not typical. The Puritan ideal for the relations of man and wife was summed up in the words, "a tender respectiveness." Surely there is no lack of warmth in the picture given by Thomas Hooker:

The man whose heart is endeared to the woman he loves, he dreams of her in the night, hath her in his eye and apprehension when he awakes, museth on her as he sits at table, walks with her when he travels and parlies with her in each place where he comes.

That the husband tenders his spouse with an endeared affection above all mortal creatures: This appears by the expressions of his respect, that all he hath, is at her command, all he can do, is wholly improved for her content and comfort, she lies in his bosom and his heart trusts in her, which forceth all to confess, that the stream of his affection, like a mighty current, runs with full tide and strength.¹³

The love letters of Quakers are marked by a peculiar ardor of affection. Take for example this one from Ann Audland in 1654 to her husband, John Audland, aged twenty-four, absent on a Quaker mission:

I received thy letters and all my soul desireth is to hear from thee in the life. Dear heart, in life dwell, there I am with thee out of all time, out of all words, in the pure power of the Lord; there is my joy and strength. Oh, how I am refreshed to hear from thee, to hear of thy faithfulness and boldness in the work

¹² A. Neave Brayshaw, *The Quakers*, 1927, p. 131.

¹³ Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

of the Lord. . . . O, dear heart, go on conquering and to conquer, knowing this that thy crown is sure. So, dear heart, now is the time of the Lord's work and few are willing to go forth into it. . . . But blessed be the Lord for ever who hath called us from doing our own work into His great work. . . . Oh, it is past my utterance to express the joy I have for thee, I am full, I am full of love towards thee, never such love as this; the mighty power of the Lord go along with thee.¹⁴

Ten years after his marriage, William Penn, about to depart for Pennsylvania, wrote to his wife: "My dear wife, remember thou wast the love of my youth, and much the joy of my life; the most beloved, as well as the most worthy of all my earthly comforts: and the reason of that love was more thy inward than thy outward excellencies, which yet were many. God knows, and thou knowest it, I can say it was a match of Providence's making."¹⁵

The advice given by Puritan divines to married couples affords an interesting contrast to that given by St. Chrysostom, who assumed that the wife would be querulous and the husband the one to assuage her complaints. Thomas Gouge, a Puritan of the seventeenth century, in his counsels for domestic harmony recognized that the fault might be on both sides and the cure must be mutual. He gives this rule:

Labor continuously and keep down all furious passions, which do usually occasion discord and dissidence. Especially when one is passionate it will be the wisdom of the other to act patience and to express a spirit of meekness. For when both are hot and angry together, then the fire of contention is likely to increase to such a flame as will not suddenly be quenched. And therefore I would commend this rule to married persons: To beware of both being angry together, but rather let one be to the other like David's harp to appease Saul's fury.¹⁶

In summary, we have observed that the sacramental view of marriage was elaborated in the early church and the Middle Ages. The romantic concept began outside of marriage in the courts of love of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in southern France and was combined with marriage in the age of the Renaissance. The view of marriage as companionship was peculiarly the work of the radical Protestant sects. Each of the three concepts has its validity. The sacramental view makes for stability, the romantic and the companionable for refinement. They can be combined in a union which commences alike in mutual love and loyalty to God and continues in lifelong fidelity and common labor in the work of the Lord.

¹⁴ Brayshaw, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

¹⁵ William I. Hull, *William Penn*, p. 33.

¹⁶ Thomas Gouge, *Works*, 1706, p. 302.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE EARLY CHURCH.

- Preisner, Herbert, "Christentum und Ehe in den ersten Jahrhunderten," *Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche* XXIII (1927).
 Schumacher, Heinrich, *Das Ehe-Ideal des Apostels Paulus* (1932).
 Gottlieb, Elfriede, *Die Frau im frühen Christentum* (1928).
 Stöcker, Lydia, *Die Frau in der alten Kirche* (1907).
 Zacharnack, Leopold, *Der Dienst der Frau in der ersten Jahrhunderten der christlichen Kirche* (1902).
 Himes, N. E., *The Medical History of Contraception* (1936).

SOURCE PASSAGES.

- Tertullian, *Ante-Nicene Fathers* III, 293-94, 404, 443; IV, 25, 28-35, 48, 53-58, 63-69.
 Clement of Alexandria, *Ante-Nicene Fathers* II, 262, 377-78.
 Jerome, *Ante-Nicene Fathers* VI, 29-30, 71, 77, 345.
 Chrysostom, *Post-Nicene Fathers*, ser. 2, XIII, 149-151.
 Augustine, *Post-Nicene Fathers*, ser. 1, III, 400-407; V, 86-87, 264-97; VI, 18-20.

THE MIDDLE AGES.

- Finke, Heinrich, *Die Frau im Mittelalter* (1913).
 Reitsenstein, Ferdinand, *Liebe und Ehe im Mittelalter* (1912).
 Koebner, Richard, "Die Eheauffassung des ausgehenden deutschen Mittelalters" *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* IX (1911), 136-198, 279-318.
 Eicken, Heinrich von, *Geschichte und System der Mittelalterliche Weltanschauung* (1887), ch. III
 Die Familie, corrected in a measure in the review by Von Hertling, *Historisches Jahrbuch* X (1889), 128-39.
 Lea, Henry C., *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy* (1867).

COURTLY LOVE AND ROMANTIC MARRIAGE.

- Lewis, C. S., *The Allegory of Love* (1936).
 Denomy, A. J., "An Inquiry into the Origins of Courtly Love," *Medieval Studies* VI (1944), 175-260.
 Compare articles in volumes VII and VIII.
 Rougemont, Denis de, *Love in the Western World* (1940).
 Fife, Robert F., "Humanistic Currents in the Reformation Era," *Germanic Review* XII (1937).

THE REFORMATION AND LUTHER.

- Kawerau, Waldermar, "Die Reformation und die Ehe," *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte* XXXIX (1892).
 Zarneke, Lilly, "Der Begriff der Liebe in Luthers Äußerungen über die Ehe," *Theologische Blätter* X, 2 (Feb., 1931), 45-49.
 "Die naturhafte Eheanschauung des jungen Luthers," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* XXV (1934-35), 281-305.
 "Luthers Stellung zur Ehescheidung und Mehrhe," *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie* XII (1934), 98-117.
 "Der geistige Sinn der Ehe bei Luther," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* CVI (1934-35), 20-29.

THE REFORMED CHURCHES AND PURITANISM.

- Köhler, Walter, "Zürcher Ehegericht und Genfer Konsistorium," *Quellen und Abhandlungen zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte* VII (1932).
 Morgan, Edmund S., *The Puritan Family* (1944).
 Schücking, Levin L., *Die Familie im Puritanismus* (1929).
 Weber, Marianne, *Ehefrau und Mutter* (1907), 280-291.
 Brayshaw, A. Neave, *The Quakers* (1927).
 Hull, William I., *William Penn* (1937).
 Gouge, Thomas, *Works* (1706).

MODERN ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

- Ostheimer, Anthony L., *The Family, a Thomistic Study in Social Philosophy* (1939). This work quotes a number of contemporary Catholics and shows a shift in Catholic thinking away from the patristic emphasis on procreation as the sole object of marriage to a greater stress upon companionship.

St. Francis of the Plains

ANNABELLE WAGNER BERGFELD

A thousand years earlier, Johnny Appleseed might have been canonized—but he lived during the transition to a materialistic age, and now lives in his apples.

THE CORN was reaching greedy arms upward and the apples were greening in the sun. It was a long time since the old man's lips had bent to crystal coolness, yet he did not thirst in spite of the heat. "Who drinks of this well," he said aloud, "will thirst again." He stopped and shifted his burden from one shoulder to another and ran his arm across his face. Suddenly a great calm came over him and his face grew bright from inner splendor. This tree—this shade—he remembered now. His hand went up to stroke the little green globe dangling above his head. "It takes a long time," he said, "a long time to comfort one with apples."

A thin curl of smoke beckoned him across the plains, and off and farther off stretched a hundred thousand miles of land—of land and apples. When he spoke again his voice included those intangibles with which he had surrounded himself and took on the sing-song with which the solitary shatters his own silence. "We will sleep yon," he said. Quickly his feet took up the stride that had carried him on long journeys through the years—that had already put twenty miles between himself and last night's bed. "There have been many," he said, "who would have given us a chair by the hearthside these years but that we had work to do."

It wasn't often that John Chapman needed a roof over his head of a summer day—especially with corn reaching up the way it was that summer afternoon of 1847. It would be warm tonight—and clear—but the need for a roof was strong within him. This was a special day. All days had reached toward it since that fair day by Boston in 1775. Shortly his knuckles fell heavily against the rough slabs and the settler's door shook on its rawhide hinges.

There was the sound of feet with the haste to welcome. John Chapman knew that sound as he knew the sound of the fleeing chipmunk with the urge to life within him. There was kindness in welcomes, and he'd known the kindness of cabin and of tepee and had warmed

his heart about them in the loneliness of star-filled prairie nights. He had news for cabins—news of the distant east; news from over the plains and “News fresh from Heaven”—warm news for the heart and cool, soothing news for the soul. He declined to sit with the family but took a bowl of bread and milk and seated himself in the doorway so as better to look at the setting sun. There was a great land out there, and it beckoned. “Come, John Chapman,” it said. “Come, follow me; first there’ll be plains and then a river—a great river and a wide river; and then there’ll be more plains into which the people will be pouring soon now, but there aren’t any trees—no trees at all, John Chapman, not just *no apple trees*. Are you coming, John Chapman?”

His lips began to move. He took a worn book from his mantle and they gathered near to hearken to the Beatitudes. Slowly the sun went down and, scorning a bed, John Chapman curled up by the dying fire. The smell of the evening meal hung heavily above him.

They’d known him a long time out there on the plains—known and trusted him. He was first reported with his apple seeds in 1801 in what was then the Territory of Ohio—and with a horse; once he was reported with a flotilla of apple-seed-loaded canoes. Mostly, however, he traveled on foot, *packing* his apple seeds. The Indians considered him a zany and let him come and go freely among them—according him, as savage people always accord the mentally deranged, the status of prophet or seer. In 1812 he went about unharmed in an area in which the British had stirred up the Indians to wholesale massacre, and he often saved many a settler as a result. Sometimes he traveled day and night,¹ warning people of approaching danger. “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,” he would shout, “and he hath anointed me to blow the trumpet in the wilderness and sound an alarm in the forest; for behold, the tribes of the heathen are around about your doors and a devouring flame followeth after them.”

At the beginning of his crusade, he secured his apple seeds from cider mills in western Pennsylvania at cider-making time in the fall. It was up there in that region that this writer first heard of him. An old apple tree by a house interested me because of the variety of its fruit and I asked about it; it appeared that a wandering fiddler had adopted Johnny Appleseed’s ways, only he would graft and play the fiddle for a night’s lodging while Johnny planted his seeds like a squirrel

¹ *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine*, Vol. XLIII, Nov., 1871, pp. 830-836. Found in *A Treasury of American Folklore*, edited by Benjamin A. Botkin, Crown Publishers, 1944, pp. 261-270.

and didn't care where he slept—and then, the fiddler had come along long after Johnny Appleseed. The story fascinated me—we had become civilized by my time, and “tramps” were an anathema to us; but my informant assured me Johnny hadn't been a tramp. Through the years his name has found its way into conversations at odd times and places, standing out like a beckoning candle from otherwise bloody pages of history. At the end of his life he was working westward from the borders of Ohio into Indiana as he had once worked into Ohio from Pennsylvania. He was not quite like the squirrel, however, for he was governed by a dream of wealth via the frontier nursery. Some day, he planned, men would come and buy—at least by the time the trees were big enough there would be a demand. Some did—and paid; some gave notes, for civilization with its burden of mortgages and due bills was approaching and the frontier moving off to the west. The really poor got their apple trees gratis—as did most of the noted in-betweens, for Johnny's idea of wealth was vague and tied up with the Hereafter and lovely ladies who would marry him *then* if he kept himself immaculate here.

Had he lived a thousand years earlier he might have been canonized before this, but unfortunately for him the fates had chosen to plant his feet on stony paths running midway between the ages devoted to the soul and those given over to the solidly material. His wealth was lavished on the poor or went to buy up mistreated animals and find them more worthy masters. Wealth—well, how much does one need to consider one's self wealthy when shirts can be made from old sacking and when feet can toughen to resist the thorns of wilderness roads? It is said he once attended a wayside meeting² at which the speaker held forth at length on barefoot Christians, asking over and over again where one such could be found. This finally nettled Johnny until he arose and said quietly, “Here's your primitive Christian.”

He was a follower of Emanuel Swedenborg and carried a set of his books along with him on his trips through the wilds. After a time a passion for educating his “fold” took possession of him and he began lending his books. When customers grew too numerous to meet the demands of the set, he cut it up. One was lucky, indeed, if he got his reading matter in consecutive issues—more often page ten would find itself wedged into some mass of gray matter anywhere between 100 and 250.

² *Ibid.*

Reading earlier books one finds many references to chills and fever, or ague, along the Ohio Valley. The more scholarly treatises designate this malady as malaria. Medical knowledge of the time was poor at best, and many medical men could neither read nor write. When the president of one of our foremost colleges set out to correct this condition, he was warned by the trustees that he would wreck the college! Consequently, it is not surprising that common folk had more faith in the Indian medicine man and the local herb doctor than in the graduate physician (which they spelled and pronounced so as to warn you what you could expect from him). To all this Johnny Appleseed added his bit, and the hand that had set apple trees far in advance of civilization now walked beside it and scattered seeds of dog fennel or Mayweed. Some people insist it was done in the spirit of pure malice toward the callous ones who thought lightly of his apple trees, and others hold that it was just a bit of agrarian horseplay that prompted him; but, crank though he may be if measured by our present-day standards, Johnny Appleseed was neither capricious nor malicious. At that time dog fennel was accepted as a sort of halfway cure for the chills and fever affecting the population.

A hundred years have passed since that day when John Chapman curled up before a dying fire. The night outside was warm and echoed to the tree-toad and the cricket, but Johnny Appleseed was tired and the way to the sunset was long and rough. It didn't seem as if he could quite make it. When they found him in the morning, his face was all alight with that to which they knew no claim and his tongue refused its office.

No one knows where they laid him. Cities have grown up and crowded out his orchards. Only the dog fennel runs along the Ohio roadsides to worry the farmers and to play the tramp to country that once knew a kinder folk. But then, a hundred years is a long time and would have claimed the orchards had there been no cities. Something remembers, though, something besides the dog fennel, and ever so often stranger hands set down a line or two in which the name of Appleseed John looks up at them—and stranger hearts beat out a bit of verse. Old books bring his time back to mind again, and children skip in pageants of the west from which the name of Appleseed John is rarely missing. Yes, even the weighty tomes we call encyclopedias give him a line or two here and there, and from their shade an old man reaches up to stroke a green globe dangling above our hearts, "It takes a long time," he says, "a long time to comfort one with apples."

The World Council of Churches An English and Anglican View

OLIVER S. TOMKINS

*Varying English and Anglican attitudes toward ecumenicity—
the potential contribution of English Christians to
the movement outlined.*

REPRESENTATIVE government is a hazardous enterprise in the modern world, but representative writing is more hazardous still. In agreeing to try and write an article interpreting the World Council from an English and Anglican viewpoint, the writer runs grave risks of being repudiated by all for whom he professes to speak. However, I am taking the risk of endeavoring to describe the World Council as seen through bifocal spectacles, one lens English and the other Anglican. *English* rather than *British* because, as every informed American knows, there is a great difference. Whether the Anglican lens will seem to American Episcopalians to be a distorting one the writer must leave to his American fellow churchmen to judge.

First, in speaking of this twofold constituency, we must acknowledge, as probably a writer from any country would have to acknowledge, that there are concentric circles of awareness of the ecumenical movement generally and of the World Council of Churches in particular, circles which range from a small inner one of actively participating individuals to a large outer circle of invincible ignorance. However, this article is aimed at representing the English equivalent of the readers of *RELIGION IN LIFE* which, not to flatter them too much, is taken to mean the intelligent churchman, whether lay or ordained, who follows the development and the news of the Christian world outside his own church as well as within it, but does so with a degree of discernment and in a constructively critical spirit.

I

The English focus. Although there is a distinctively British Christian tradition, it is not altogether the same as the English. The religious scene in Scotland is dominated by the Church of Scotland more than the Church of England today dominates England. Indeed, the Englishman in Scotland often feels, when he sees the high level of church-

going and the veneration in which the ministry is still held in public esteem, that he is catching a glimpse of a vanished Victorian England, at least in those areas of its life where the Calvinistic strain in its pedigree was dominant. Wales until very recently was dominated by the peculiarly Welsh forms of Nonconformity, whilst the Church in Wales was a church of the foreign land-owning aristocracy. In Wales today there is something of a change, since the acids of industrialism have eaten into the life of the Welsh chapels, and a small but vigorous Welsh-speaking Anglicanism is on the increase. Ireland, both North and South, is dominated by the conflict with Roman Catholicism, in which the various shades of Protestantism are less marked, though the Church of Ireland certainly exhibits a robust Anglicanism and a sturdy scholarship in the best traditions of Bishop Berkeley.

In England, the interplay between the Church of England and Protestant Dissent has, especially in recent centuries, been the interplay of more nearly equal participants in determining a distinct religious tradition. Although Roman Catholicism has a vigorous intelligentsia, and pockets of strong local life, it is not a religious force constantly in the mind of the average Englishman except when something happens to rekindle the always smoldering fires of Smithfield and to revive the ancient cry "No Popery."

Nevertheless, although the following paragraphs profess to speak primarily for England, a great deal of what is said can be regarded as true in greater or less degree of the other three kingdoms. Certainly, when full allowance has been made for their differences, the British delegation to Amsterdam still have certain deep things in common.

When the British delegation looks at itself in the context of the membership of the Amsterdam Assembly it will surely wish to assert that it represents a corporate reality. The impact of the Asiatic and African churches will inevitably not be very great, though it will be there, and will be a token of an influence that must grow. The two main blocks will be the North American and the European. In contradistinction to these, the British will consider themselves as having a distinctive contribution to make.

On the one hand will stand the considerable influence of the North American delegation, even though within it the Canadian contribution will have its own quality. But the American churches will come to Amsterdam representing almost the only secure and prosperous area remaining in the world. Their outlook, in confidence, sense of responsi-

bility, and awareness of power, as well as in more subtle ways, cannot fail to be colored by that fact. This security and prosperity have been increasing in strength throughout the history of the U. S. A., which has never known a military or diplomatic defeat. Americans have in their own country scarcely met any of the hardships of war, but they are constantly called upon to come to the rescue of a continent which appears to many of them as nothing but a source of needless and largely meaningless conflict, caused by the survival of obsolete nationalities. If they turn away from these appeals they are accused of "isolationism," yet when they take an initiative in world affairs they are suspected of economic imperialism. A majority, perhaps a large majority, of Americans are profoundly suspicious of the collectivist trend in European economic development. In the ecclesiastical sphere, their strong tradition of separation between church and state makes many of the problems that Europe faces in this field incomprehensible and irritating. On the whole, they will represent a theology of practical activity, though the once parodied accents of the "social gospel" will not be as noticeable as many Europeans will expect.

The European churchmen will come from countries in which their churches are often the only forces which survived a flood of defeat, disillusionment, and despair. They will often be conscious—and justly so—of a recovered authenticity of faithfulness, devotion, and Christian fellowship, beside which the moods all too characteristic of religion in democratic countries may well appear disturbingly inadequate. For them a "theology of crisis" has not been primarily an intellectual revaluation; it has been the divine illumination of experiences of disillusion and tragedy. It will be difficult for many to feel an inclination to learn from those who have been free to pursue their democratic objectives of liberty and justice without risk of persecution or even of interruption.

Compared with the ecumenical conferences of before the war, there will certainly be heard voices in each of these two camps which were previously expected only of the other. There will be voices from America speaking of the exceeding sinfulness of humanity, and voices from the continent speaking of the need for the Church to recover a vigorous initiative in the creation of a just and humane society. But the contrast will still be marked, and the British delegation will not feel that it belongs wholly to either side.

Just as there has often been an inclination to refer to the Church of England as a "bridge church," so it is now fashionable to refer to Britain

as a "bridge nation." To quote a memorandum written by Mr. Maurice Reckitt for the British Council of Churches in this connection:

The metaphor is not in fact a very happy one in either case. People do not commonly use a bridge for the purpose of meeting their antagonists and reconciling their differences with them: they use it rather for passing from one side of a dividing line to another. Anglicanism may justly resent being regarded as having no essential position of its own, and no function other than that of serving as a temporary resting place for those who contemplate passing on to somewhere else. Similarly, Britain would not be complacently regarded by most of her people as primarily a sort of convenient laboratory in which social experiments can be tried out for the benefit of other nations curious to see how the constituent elements of communism, individualism, monetary incentive, social compulsion, bureaucracy and functional responsibility can be most happily blended. In the first place, there are still very considerable differences on these matters among our own people, and in the second place, most of us are disposed to believe that in so far as we may contrive to make a success of the social projects we undertake, it will be because they are rightly related to our own particular genius as a people, and call upon moral resources and civic qualities which we have developed in the course of a history which has been very much our own. It is easy to exaggerate—or at any rate to misstate—the degree to which one people can "teach" political and social lessons to another; and it would be presumptuous in us to suppose that other regions and nations either ought to or need wish to reproduce a social or economic structure which may be ill suited to their temperament or their capacities.

Nevertheless, Britain in general and England in particular may have a distinct vocation in the ecumenical world as a whole, which can be symbolized in the role of the British delegation to Amsterdam. Surely Britain's peculiar war experiences—tribulation without occupation, the grant of victory without the promise of prosperity—should fit her to play a specific role in the attempted reconstruction of human order. But England's claim to a specific contribution does not rest primarily upon her role in the recent world conflict. It rests upon certain achievements derived from her history, both religious and national.

The upshot of our political development since 1660 has been the establishment of two principles—or more precisely subconscious assumptions—more securely rooted here perhaps than anywhere else in the world: respect for the civic rights of the person, and the notion of government not as an instrument of power for a triumphant faction, but as the upshot of a majority exercising initiative and an only slightly less responsible minority whose function is not so much obstruction as construction by criticism. (It is difficult to believe that any other country in the world could understand, much less adopt, the practice by which the leader of "His Majesty's Opposition" is a salaried servant of the Crown.) It is these two characteristics of our public life that are the essence of what the British people understand by "democracy," which is something distinct from (and, as we believe, more politically mature than) what that word is taken to mean in other lands. There are certain other characteristics of our social life—a great capacity for the spon-

taneous generation of functional associations, a tradition of unpaid public service and all that is meant by "voluntaryism"—which have done much to create the mood and ethos of public life which is typically British. At the moment this country is groping its way to the evolution of new social techniques in its economic life, compounded of statutory control, the public utility board, private enterprise within limits, and (though much too feebly) trade union responsibility and "workers' control." The problems involved naturally arouse the keenest controversy, and the consequent method of trial and error may involve not a few trials and a good many errors, but there is perhaps no other country in the world where efforts so ambitious could be carried through with less danger of social conflict or political upheaval.

Religiously, the situation is again distinctive. There are few countries in this post-Christian age where "diffused religion" still exercises so much influence. In England (and perhaps it is even more true of Scotland) the lingering effects of an established Church are still strong. Establishment is easy to deride. In theory, and less sharply in practice, many find it intolerable. But more thoughtful churchmen, whether of the established Church or of the Free Churches, are less than ever willing to throw away wantonly the values to be derived from the right to speak to the State as to a self-acknowledged part of a Christian commonwealth. As Dr. Temple once defined the matter: "It is the duty of Lambeth to remind Westminster of its responsibility to God, but this does not mean that Westminster is responsible to Lambeth." The Church of England is older than the realm of England; its revenues are independent of the State and its clergy have never been paid by the government, as they have been in some continental countries. The only exception is with regard to service and prison chaplains—cases in which the same is true of Nonconformist ministers.

But in England the established Church has long had the benefit of Protestant dissent, which has done much to offset the complacency into which an established church may easily fall. Nonconformity has in its turn created a vigorous type of religious life, especially in the industrial working classes, which has never quite vanished. Although few of our new ruling class in the present Labor government are today active Methodist local preachers, a high proportion of them either were in their youth or had fathers who were. The "Nonconformist conscience" lingers on in an attenuated form, and has not only prevented that divorce between radicalism and Christianity so characteristic of the Continent, but has given even the secular Labor politicians a framework of Puritan values and an awareness that politics is concerned with *people* which are still precious.

All these hastily sketched factors contribute to the conviction that in

the interplay between the European and American forces in the ecumenical movement, the British tradition will have its own distinctive contribution to make.

II

Within this wider context, let us turn now to look at the Anglican focus. Just as there are subtle differences between England and Britain, so there are subtle differences between the attitude of the Church of England and the Anglican churches in Ireland and Wales and the Episcopal Church in Scotland. Just as it would be hazardous to write *English* and suppose it always to mean *British*, so it would be hazardous to write *Church of England* and let it always mean *Anglican*. But subject to this caveat, let us try to speak of Anglicanism in its attitude toward the ecumenical movement, the more so since the Amsterdam Assembly will take place very soon after an event which will have made the Church of England more than usually aware of its place in the total concert of Anglicanism. The Lambeth Conference and the Amsterdam Assembly provoke some interesting comparisons.

The one will be the eighth meeting in its series, the other the first. The one will represent the world-wide gathering of one of the most strongly established church traditions of the world, the other will represent a heterogeneous assortment of ecclesiastical traditions, many of which will barely have encountered one another before. Although both claim no legislative power, but only a moral authority, the declarations of Lambeth will be episcopal declarations in a church which gives a high, though undefined, position to bishops in its conception of authority. The World Council Assembly will have to rely entirely upon vindicating its pronouncements by their appeal to the Christian conscience unaided by any such ecclesiastical tradition.

Within the Anglican Communion it is perhaps possible to discern five main attitudes toward the ecumenical movement.

1. First there is the Evangelical wing, which welcomes the prospect of strengthening the long Anglican tradition of friendship toward European Protestant churches and what many English churchmen regard as the daughters of English Protestant dissent in America. Perhaps in more extreme Evangelical quarters there is some shyness about having too much dealings with the Orthodox, though all genuinely *Anglican* Evangelicals welcome this opportunity also. There is in process in the Church of England something of a revival of Evangelical theology within a younger group, which is essentially ecumenical, and has revived the

Anglican sixteenth-century interest in continental Protestant theology. The outstanding Evangelical newspaper, the *Record*, is among the most informed and cordial of all English church papers in its attitude toward the ecumenical movement.

2. Modernism seems a little apprehensive that the World Council is dominated by "Barthian theology." It must be confessed that in this context "Barthian" is often loosely used to describe all forms of Protestant neo-orthodoxy, including those which Karl Barth most vigorously denounces. There has been some criticism in Modernist quarters of the creedal basis of the World Council, and the writer has the impression that Modernism, as expressed for example in Bishop Barnes's latest book, still stands in the stage of Protestant liberalism which finds small place for the doctrine of the Church. Since it is undeniable that the recovery of the doctrine of the Church is one of the mainsprings of the ecumenical movement, this type of Modernism is by definition unlikely to be cordial toward a strongly Church-conscious ecumenicity.

3. By the same token, Anglo-Catholicism is both interested and critical; interested because a passionate concern for Church unity emerged from the earliest days of the Oxford Movement, critical because it conceives that Church unity primarily in terms of approach to Eastern Orthodoxy and the Catholic West. In Anglo-Catholic circles there is inevitably a good deal of ignorant prejudice against the ecumenical movement, but in informed circles the atmosphere is much more that of friendly criticism and critical friendship. For example, a recently produced report entitled "*Catholicity: a Study in the Conflict of Christian Traditions in the West*" was written by a group which includes such leading Anglo-Catholics as Canon V. A. Demant, Dom Gregory Dix, Mr. T. S. Eliot, Father A. G. Hebert, Canon A. M. Ramsey, and Father Lionel Thornton. Although the report does not deal specifically with the World Council of Churches, it lays down very clearly the desiderata of Christian unity. Its basic concept is what it calls "the primitive wholeness," a wholeness which it believes to have been manifested by the undivided Church of the early centuries, and describes the task of Christian reunion as the task of rediscovering and making effectual that primitive wholeness from which we have all departed.

Thus this group would go the whole way with all those who maintain that Christian unity is the will of God, and that true Catholicity is not exhibited by any of the existing churches. What they would distinctively assert is that there does exist a pattern of Christian unity which

has never historically been totally lost, and that of course one of its key-notes is the apostolic episcopate. They deny that Christian unity can be restored by the manipulation, as it were, of the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle which have got out of position, but would say that it can only be restored by the uncovering and restoration of a given and still existing pattern. But those who have given most thought to it also admit that these convictions of theirs are not inconsistent with wholehearted participation in the World Council of Churches, but rather constitute an argument for their participation—since it is only through their testifying to these convictions among those who disagree with them, rather than in a corner by themselves, that Christian truth will gain ground.

The remaining two attitudes are not so much ecclesiastical as emotional types.

4. The first may be described as the "emotionally progressive," the type who, generally eschewing any identification with the foregoing three, welcome anything new because it is new. They are well illustrated by the enthusiastic gentleman whom the writer met in a railroad coach. He was on his way to the National Assembly of the Church of England, and explained that he was a member of the group known in the Church Assembly lobbies as the "nonparty group"—they were a group who got together from time to time to support "new measures." He enthusiastically described half a dozen fundamentally incompatible aims for which he proposed to vote, and on discovering the writer's occupation said, "We are very keen on the World Council of Churches too." Only courtesy suppressed the reply, "I was afraid you would be."

5. The remaining type may be called simply staunch Anglican. They represent an all too large section of the Church. Unaware that others exist, unaware that the world is changing, unaware of anything but what they were brought up to like, they show a quite genial but irresistible barrier to the penetration of new insights.

I have refrained from describing Youth as a distinct category. Although our church suffers from the contemporary disease of adulating youth as a separate genus, it is true that most of them are first of all to be found largely within one or other of the preceding categories, but that they have by definition a greater accessibility to new ideas than many of their elders.

III

Englishman and Anglican together face the first Assembly of the World Council with certain queries, but they are not for the most part

distinctive questions. They are questions common to most of those who have thought about the possibilities of the Assembly.

There is the problem of its *authority*, though perhaps for the Anglican who stresses the authority of bishops the status of a nonepiscopal Assembly has particular difficulties. There is the problem of "*the churches and the Church*," though again one's ecclesiastical convictions define both the terms in which one poses the problem and in which one would like to solve it. There is sharp cleavage of opinion within the British delegation on the question of *pronouncements* by the World Council. There are some churchmen long committed to the habit of issuing church pronouncements and setting great store by them. There are others who are highly skeptical of the value of such pronouncements and highly critical of the competence of ecclesiastical assemblies to pronounce at all upon the complex technical problems of the modern age. There is the whole problem of the *comprehensiveness* of the World Council and the price at which it may be bought. Just as every Englishman would like to see the Russian state co-operate with the Western world if it could do so on tolerable terms, so Christian Englishmen would like to see the Russian church co-operate with the Western churches. Perhaps the only point at which the British delegation would have a distinctive answer to give to one of the problems concerning the World Council is the point with which we began. The World Council faces a problem of *balance within itself between its parts*. Some fear that it will be an American conference held in a European city with some European visitors; some fear that it will be a European conference accepting, with the same mingled feelings as Europe accepts American aid, the presence of the American contingent! The British are convinced that it must be neither of these, but a conference in which they too may be heard and recognized as having a right to give as well as the privilege to receive.

Slowly but surely amongst English Christians the awareness is dawning that the Amsterdam Assembly is going to be held, and that it may be of great importance. Our expectations are sober but profound. The war strengthened our awareness of the world solidarity of Christians, though we suffer from no facile internationalism. If God grants us time, we see in the World Council the beginnings of a building of great promise. But whether the time be long or short, we see clearly that it is the divinely ordained next step.

The Forgotten Factor in Educating for Peace*

GEORGE P. MICHAELIDES

International organization can help but not insure the maintenance of peace—religion at the center of education is a fundamental need.

IT IS GENERALLY admitted that our world today is cruel, selfish, cynical, divided, and gripped by a fear of insecurity. Though feeling the effects of such a state of affairs, most of us are doing nothing about it—not because we do not care, but because we feel frustrated and helpless. A few earnest souls here and there, realizing the gravity of the situation, passionately and sincerely are endeavoring not only to find a way out but also to convince the resigned masses that there is such a way out.

Some of these people believe that the solution of the problems of the world lies basically in the direction of building up a strong international organization. They advocate heartily the support of the United Nations with gradual improvements and its gradual evolution into a World Government. As a prerequisite for the realization of this dream they advocate that the nations curtail their sovereignty and delegate at least part of it to this central authority. On the surface there can be little disagreement with such a view. The cause of peace will be promoted only as nations give up the anarchic principle of absolute national sovereignty and organize on a wider basis.

At the same time, however, no one should be content with the idea that concentration of power in the hands of any one person or organization will usher in an age of international peace and good will. It will doubtless help, but it will not fully remedy the situation. There has been, for instance, a monopoly of power within families, industries, and states; but its existence did not automatically bring forth justice, nor peace, nor love. Reliance even on the best of governments alone is not the cure-all so many people imagine. Governments have to be grounded upon certain principles, which in turn have to rest on moral foundations. The presence or absence of moral principles determine

*Based on an address delivered by the author at his inauguration as president of Schauffler College in Cleveland, Ohio.

whether a government—be it national or international—will prove a blessing or a curse. The history of recent years gives us ample proof that governments based on wrong principles and exercising central control developed into the worst type of totalitarianism. If such authority be permitted to control the whole world, it can transform it into an inferno worse than that of the first and second World Wars, and worse even than that conceived in the imagination of Dante. The world obviously needs some principle other than centralization to regulate the power of government.

Those who see this angle of the problem are convinced that the untamed power of government must be reduced through subordination to law. They point out, for instance, the fact that the Big Five have placed themselves above law by appropriating to themselves the exclusive use of the veto power. Through this device they serve primarily their own selfish interests and perpetuate the chaotic conditions now prevailing throughout the world. Were the Big Five willing to modify this policy and place themselves under law, so that the same law would hold them as responsible and accountable as the smaller nations, the whole picture of the world would be radically transformed and mankind would enter into a period of real and lasting peace. The arguments in favor of this solution are strong and convincing, and have become quite popular, especially since the appearance of Emery Reves's book, *The Anatomy of Peace*.

But will law solve the problems of the world? Although we all know the incontestable value of law, and although we all gladly pay tribute to its achievements, we cannot afford to ignore its limitations. It is often forgotten, when we propose to place everything under law, that there are good laws and bad laws. Law may heap blessings upon us, but in the hands of an aggressor it may prove a veritable scourge to mankind. Unjust laws repeatedly precipitated revolutions; unjust laws perpetuated slavery, child labor, and many other abominations. The laws of the Third Reich exterminated six million Jews. Law, like government, can prove beneficial to humanity only when it springs from moral convictions. What we therefore need is law *and* moral principles.

However, this hardly settles the issue. Even when law is based on excellent principles, we are faced with a different problem. A man may keep the law, yet remain an unregenerate sinner. We know, alas, too many who keep the letter of the law yet break its spirit and develop the unattractive traits of pharisaism, hypocrisy, and self-righteousness.

What is true of individuals is true of institutions. Something more then is needed than law and moral principles, namely, the *will* to keep the law.

Yet even here we face a serious difficulty. People with most excellent intentions to keep the law fail to do so, because they conclude that the law demands far too much from them. Consequently they give up their efforts in despair or live in constant conflict with themselves for being incorrigible law-breakers, very much in the pattern of the earlier years of Augustine, Luther, and others. Many of us, therefore, find ourselves in the unenviable position in which we need to repeat Paul's words:

For the good which I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I practice. . . . Wretched man that I am! . . . I of myself with the mind, indeed, serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin (Romans 7:19, 24).

Of course, not all men go through such a struggle. To ease their conscience the majority of people and of organizations under law take recourse to subterfuge, evasion, and rationalization. They pay lip service to law, but in reality ignore it, forget it, and do exactly the opposite of what it demands. All one has to bring to mind in the domestic field is the era of Prohibition, remembered mostly for the flagrant violation of its letter and spirit even by people who claimed adherence to the principles which had prompted its adoption. In the international field no one can forget the farcical application of the articles of the Covenant of the League of Nations, as well as the perfect failure of the governments of the world to apply the Kellogg-Briand Pact. "The High Contracting Powers solemnly promise . . ." or words to that effect, meant nothing and proved hollow when selfish national and imperialistic interests were at stake. Something was lacking in these cases, something strongly suggestive of the truth that we cannot legislate individuals or nations into goodness. Decidedly something more than the will to obey is needed to enable men to keep such a law as

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind . . . and thy neighbor as thyself.

Infinitely more is needed to "fulfill the law," that is, to do what the law demands plus much more, as in the case of

Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies. . . . Whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him two. . . .

That something more, we are told, is provided by education; and

those of us engaged in educational work are ready to defend this thesis with all our might. Education can train in the making and the keeping of laws. Nevertheless we cannot forget that those condemned at Nuremberg were educated people. "Yes, but," we are reminded, "they were not properly educated. What the world needs is proper, democratic education." True; yet we who were democratically educated did not hesitate to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Education is clearly a sharp, two-edged tool in the hands of those who wield it; it cuts both ways.

What then? The Harvard Report, one of several studies recently made in the interests of better education for tomorrow, says this: "Education is not complete without moral guidance." It then adds significantly: "Moral guidance may be obtained from our religious heritage." One would expect after such an admission that some place would be given in our educational system of tomorrow to this source of moral guidance. Instead, the Report turns its face away from its own recommendation and explains: "Given the American scene with its varieties of faith and even of unfaith, we did not feel justified in proposing religious instruction as part of the curriculum."

At this point the present writer, along with others in religious and educational circles, begs to disagree with the Harvard Report. It seems to us that it dodges the issue, evades the responsibility, and ignores the most important phase of our social crisis. We prefer to face the problem squarely and attempt to solve it in the proper way. To be explicit: the type of education visualized by us holds that Government, Law, Science, Education can function to the benefit of mankind in so far as they rest on moral principles; that the bases of moral principles are to be found in religion and specifically in the Christian religion; and that power to do that which is right comes from the dynamic of the Christian faith. A Christian educational organization, therefore, should aim to make its contribution along this line by discovering in Christianity the principles of moral guidance and placing them in the very center of the lives of men and women as the strongest motivating factors for conduct. Christian educators should take to heart the words uttered by Dr. George A. Buttrick at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges held in January, 1947, in Boston:

There must be a restoration of religion in education to save the world. The student infers that religion is a kind of necktie, whereas in actuality religion is the main artery of a man's neck.

This responsibility rests upon every Christian educational institution. More so, it is the absolute imperative for institutions training for Christian service. Repeatedly such institutions have slipped into the pitfall of emphasizing the "social" and ignoring the "religious," lest they be accused of embracing impractical idealism.

However, by placing religion in the center of education and life, it is not proposed that the ideal should be stressed at the expense of the actual. Divorce between the two invariably produces daydreamers on the one hand and activists on the other. A Christian school, training for life and service, should combine the social and the religious outlook. It should give to religion social direction and to social work religious motivation. It is the essence of the Christian philosophy of such an educational institution that no religious worker can serve as he should, nor can a Christian live as he should, without a social vision. It holds moreover that no social worker can do all he is capable of doing without drawing upon religious resources. Those training workers for religious service should hold high and should cherish the ideal of a "cup of cold water in Christ's name"; for it does make a world of difference whether that cup of water is offered in the name of Christ or in the name of past, present, and future Hitlers.

An educational institution training for life in our social order and especially educating Christian youth for service should attempt to do four things, besides offering the facts considered essential to living:

First, it should help its students to see the existing evils of society as well as the causes underlying them, so that they will work and in turn inspire or train others to work and to struggle and to sacrifice for their elimination.

Second, it should offer them a sense of direction, so that throughout life they will move and will train others to move toward the Kingdom of God, through the establishment of a beloved society within which the doing of the will of God will be the supreme concern of all men.

In the third place it should pass on to them the conviction that theirs is not a task which they alone will or can do, nor even a task which they can do along with other human beings. It is a task which calls for close fellowship and co-operation with God. Every Christian has to be a laborer together with God, a fellow worker with Christ.

Lastly, as it trains its students to go out to live and serve in the midst of a world which has the capacity to drain the very last vestige of vitality even from the strongest human body and soul—it should

try to impart to them the faith that they are not alone, nor do they need to depend on their own strength alone; but that at all times and everywhere they can fall back upon God, the infinite source of power unto all good things, to replenish their exhausted resources.

People brought up in this manner will develop both the will and the ability more earnestly to seek, find, and do the will of God and to put into execution the highest Christian ideals. As they do so, that part of the power of government which is evil will gradually lose its sting: law, science, education, social service, and religion will become more positive, more constructive, more creative; a larger portion of peace will then be made real to the people of the world. Basically it is a matter of "seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

Experiencing Albert Schweitzer

EVERETT SKILLINGS

*Personal experience with the most versatile genius of our
time—survey of recent books about him—
a tribute to his unflinching spirit.*

I

MY FIRST DIRECT CONTACT with Dr. Schweitzer was in November, 1932. During a stay in the beautiful old town of Freiburg on the edge of the Black Forest, my wife and I had the good fortune of being invited to visit him. We had learned that he was on furlough from his African hospital and staying at his boyhood home, the little village of Günsbach in Upper Alsace, only a few hours' distant from us, across the Rhine. In the preceding March, he had delivered the memorial address in Frankfort on the hundredth anniversary of the death of Goethe, and now was just beginning to work on the third volume of his *Philosophy of Civilization*.

The visit proved a great experience for us. We arrived about noon and were surprised to find Dr. Schweitzer at the station to meet us, accompanied by Fräulein Kottman, one of his nurses, also home on furlough. As we looked out of the car window, we recognized our host from his pictures, towering above the other people on the platform. We had not expected to see so large a man, for we had read in his autobiography about his mother weeping over him when he was a baby because he was such a weakling. However, so well proportioned is he, that his height does not seem unusual except by comparison with other people. He was then in his early sixties, but with his shock of black hair and black mustache, only slightly grayed, he really looked ten years younger.

His deep-set eyes are dark blue and usually carry a dreamy, far-off look, but often they twinkle merrily—for we discovered almost at once that he has a lively sense of humor. Even though he looked tired, he impressed us as having great physical vigor. His shoulders are slightly stooped, as if bearing the burdens of the world as well as his own personal ones. We learned that his wife was then in a sanitarium in Berlin, ill with a chronic disease contracted in a prison camp during the first World War, and that their only child, Rhena, thirteen years old, was

away at school in Königsfeld in the Black Forest. As we walked the half hour or so from the railroad station to the little village nestling among the green foothills of the Vosges mountains, even in the rain of that dark November day, there hovered a tranquil never-to-be-forgotten beauty over the quiet landscape. We found Dr. Schweitzer to be as simple and sincere as one would expect a truly great man to be, and we plunged immediately into conversation. He made us feel at home in no time. He plied me with question after question about our country, about politics, prohibition, and many other subjects. He asked, for instance, "Will you kindly tell me what is the difference, if any, between your Democratic and Republican parties?" He said he had time to read only the medical journals from America, and was therefore eager for information on other matters.

Arrived at the house, we were greeted by his secretary, Frau Emmy Martin, and found dinner ready. All through the meal the Herr Doktor's jokes and pleasantries kept us in high spirits. After dinner we had coffee in the living room, coffee raised on their Lambaréné plantation which they had hoped would yield a profit for the hospital but which had been a dismal failure financially because of the depressed condition of the world market. Coffee finished, Frau Martin said: "Now Herr Schweitzer must rest. It is necessary, since he works very late every night at his writing." Left to ourselves, our eyes wandered around this simple but charming living room. Beautiful paintings, grand piano, and old brasses gave it an atmosphere of both culture and *Gemütlichkeit*. Then we looked out of the window upon the shining river winding its way through the Münstertal and upon the gently rolling hills beyond. What a contrast was this home and this tranquil scene to the life at Lambaréné! How much Dr. Schweitzer, with his sensitive love of beauty, must love his fellow men to relinquish all this, including his music, for the crude conditions in Africa. But this modern mystic with his poetic soul is also a man of action, and he said he felt himself drawn to Africa by an irresistible power.

At the end of an hour, the *Mittagsruh'* was over, but Schweitzer still looked tired as he returned to the living room. We were now invited to take a sight-seeing trip through the village. As we walked along the narrow streets, he had a few words for everyone we met. He talked with all ages intimately and jokingly in the Alsatian dialect. Several times he left us for a few minutes to call on some old or sick person.

We visited the school and the parsonage, temporarily vacant, where he had lived as a boy. He made the empty rooms seem suddenly to come alive again.

Finally we reached the village church, shared by both Catholic and Protestant, like so many village churches in Alsace. He took us up to the organ which had recently been renovated under his direction. He pointed out its good points of mechanism, its simplicity, and especially its wonderful liquid tones, which he said were hard to equal in modern organs. We already knew from his autobiography that he had traveled all over Europe to advise upon the rebuilding of old instruments. "Now," said Dr. Schweitzer, "sit down and I will give you a little music." As soon as he began to play, all trace of care left his face; and his huge frame, bent somewhat over the keyboard, became at once completely absorbed in the music. Not a sign of conscious effort was visible; the sounds seemed to be a part of him flowing easily from his hands and feet. His hands, so huge and capable and beautiful, at first held our attention, but soon we, too, became absorbed in the music. He played on and on without notes, first a few hymns, then a Bach fugue, one composed in his youth, and finally a Mendelssohn selection. Finally Fräulein Kottman reminded him that we should go home to tea.

After tea, when we were making preparations for departure, the doctor disappeared into his study, returning presently with an envelope. In it was a little carved ivory elephant from Lambaréné, a gift for our little daughter who was to celebrate her birthday in a day or two. "Now remember," said he, "no thank-you letter!" His parting words were "*Aufwiedersehen, hoffentlich in Amerika.*" That was in 1932. We spent the following winter in Munich, and Hitler became Chancellor. Then came September, 1939, and World War II, and our *Aufwiedersehen* is yet to come! ¹

But after all, more important than experiencing Schweitzer face to face—a rare privilege indeed—is to come under the spell of his personality through reading and pondering his books and those written about him. Future generations will profit by his wisdom probably more than we of today. They will see his prophecies coming true, and, let us believe, heed his message better than we.

¹Through the courtesy of the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, Inc., I have used, by paraphrase, parts of an article, "A Day With Albert Schweitzer," written by my wife and published in the *American-German Review*, September, 1935.

II

Three outstanding Schweitzer books were published last year: Hermann Hagedorn's *Prophet in the Wilderness*,² George Seaver's *Albert Schweitzer: The Man and His Mind*,³ and Charles R. Joy's *Albert Schweitzer: An Anthology*.⁴

Mr. Hagedorn has chosen a very fitting title for his book, for it is as a "prophet in the wilderness" that Schweitzer is of special significance to our generation. The author has said that the thought uppermost in mind as he wrote the book was to offer a new hero for postwar German youth to take the place of Adolf Hitler; instead of Hitler's objective: *World Power or Downfall*, to substitute Schweitzer's: *Reverence for Life*.

The biographies by Hagedorn and Seaver, one soon discovers, supplement each other. One is written by a poet, the other by a scholar. Schweitzer has been called a "whole" man; and to get the whole picture of him, one should by all means read both books. Hagedorn's poetic prose matches that of Schweitzer. Compare, for instance, Hagedorn's writing on the first page of Chapter VIII with Schweitzer's quoted on the first page of Chapter I. As a youth Schweitzer is said to have tried his hand at verse, but he soon decided that this was not his natural medium of expression. However, all his prose is poetic, like that of Hagedorn, who writes that his hero's eyes are "faintly lighted with hope. What he sees is tragic and terrifying, but he knows that above the dark canopy there are stars; and there are flowers where he goes which he will greet as a child might greet them, with simple gaiety."

After reading Hagedorn's fascinating biography a friend wrote to me: "I feel like shouting about it from the housetops. What a rare individual Albert Schweitzer is—he seems to have attained to all that one would like to at the finest moments in life. A man like that gives you courage and hope. And the book is beautifully written with great perception and feeling." This person's comment illustrates how many people are experiencing Albert Schweitzer. *A Prophet in the Wilderness* is an ideal book to introduce a person to this experience. I know of none its equal for this purpose except Schweitzer's own *Memories of Childhood and Youth*, the most beautiful book he ever wrote.

Happily, as we turn to Seaver's *Albert Schweitzer: The Man and*

² New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. pp. 221. \$3.00.

³ New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. xiii-346. \$3.75.

⁴ New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. 323. \$3.75.

His Mind, the first chapter is entitled "Memories of Childhood and Youth." The terse opening sentence of Seaver's book is a perfect characterization of the significance of the man: "Albert Schweitzer is probably the most gifted genius of our age, as well as its most prophetic thinker." Indeed, the whole paragraph is notable for its swift survey of his achievements expressed in compact sentences.

Part I gives the story of his life in twelve chapters, which are chronologically arranged, alternating the four Lambaréné periods with chapters devoted to "furloughs" in Europe. Seaver has succeeded well in impressing on the reader the amazing activity with which Schweitzer crowded his days in nearly every country of Europe. Part I is important as building the background for Part II, which discusses Schweitzer's great intellectual and spiritual achievements. Both parts give evidence of the painstaking thoroughness of Seaver's study extending over twenty years. We also notice the precision of language of the scholar. He interprets and evaluates Schweitzer's chief works in biblical criticism, music, and philosophy under the following chapter headings: "The Quest of the Historical Jesus," "The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle," "Music and the Music of J. S. Bach," "Indian Thought and Its Development," "The Ethic of Reverence for Life."

In regard to Charles R. Joy's book, *Albert Schweitzer: An Anthology*, it should be said, first of all, that the important thing for the reader is, as in the case of the Bible, not to read about the book, but to read the book itself. It is definitely a book to live with, and for a lifetime—to read much and ponder more. In his philosophical writings, Dr. Schweitzer urges individuals repeatedly to feel it their duty to think. In this extremely well-edited volume which contains the quintessence of Albert Schweitzer's productive thought, the editor's object is to furnish the reader a stimulus to his own thinking by showing him how Schweitzer does his thinking.

The author's introduction, entitled "A Modern Man's Quest for the Holy Grail," is no ordinary preface. It is a vivid and colorful picture of Dr. Schweitzer sketched against the tropical landscape on a bright day. He is sitting by a window writing letters to his friends. "A little fawn nudges him, asking to be petted, and the big hand drops its pen and gently strokes the animal." This he calls "the poetry of Africa."

Then in contrast, he depicts "the prose of Africa": swamps, decaying villages, ragged Negroes, the deadly climate, malignant mosquitoes, tsetse flies, termites, droves of marching ants, jiggers, venomous snakes,

leopard-men. The untiring activity of doctors and nurses has to do with very unpleasant things—dysentery, thousands dying of sleeping sickness (“the killing disease”), strangulated hernia, phagedenic ulcers, from which the good doctor himself has suffered, little children lying in a state of malarial coma, lepers whose fingers and toes disappear, a man bored by the tusks of an elephant, and another with hand torn by the frightful teeth of a gorilla. “This to him,” says Dr. Joy, “is the glorious activity of which he writes to his distant friends. This to us is the prose of Africa which underlies all the rhythm of its poetry. . . . Here then (in the *Anthology*) is Albert Schweitzer: the healer, the thinker, the seeker, the teacher, the singer. The world is becoming aware that his life and thought are destined to influence profoundly the spirit of our time.”

III

The criticism has been made that the plentiful literature about Schweitzer has all been “entirely and completely laudatory.” Such is indeed the case when one writes about the man! But as regards some of his ideas there is an abundance of critical dissent. Seaver, for instance, maintains objectivity throughout his scholarly volume. Of Schweitzer’s book, *Christianity and the Religions of the World*, he writes that it does justice neither to the subjects, which it surveys too cursorily, nor to the future author of *Indian Thought and Its Development*.⁵

The late Professor Oscar Kraus of Prague is a notable case of a Schweitzer friend and ardent admirer who rejected Schweitzer’s philosophy as “a mystic speculative phase of modern thought.”⁶ Yet he wrote:

I do not think I exaggerate when I maintain that the cultural world of today has produced no one who could equal Albert Schweitzer in originality, in many-sidedness, and in the intensity of his intellectual, his artistic, and above all in his ethical qualities. . . . Schweitzer *lives* his philosophy of compassion; it is compassion in action; he only feels pity for others, never for himself.⁷

Schweitzer’s most controversial book is *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. It created a sensation in the world of biblical scholarship when it first appeared in England in 1910, and scholars are still discussing the book and are still divided in opinion about it. Seaver devotes over thirty-eight pages to it and his discussion throughout is remarkably clear, considering the extreme complexity of the material. He has also sys-

⁵ Seaver, George, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

⁶ Kraus, Albert Schweitzer and his Philosophy, quoted by Seaver, p. 82.

⁷ *Ibid.*, quoted by Seaver, p. 83.

tematized what Schweitzer has written in different books and at different times, and by so doing has given clarity to all of Schweitzer's ideas.

At this point it might be well to remark that many people have the mistaken notion that the ideas which Schweitzer attributes to Jesus about the end of the world and the coming of the Kingdom are also his own beliefs. This is not true, for Schweitzer says he believes Jesus to have been mistaken. In writing of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, Seaver is wise in letting Schweitzer speak for himself in numerous quotations. He notes the high literary quality of *The Quest* and the wealth of its metaphors, "as apt as they are unexpected, they seem to spring to the mind of the writer effortlessly."⁸

Seaver makes it clear that he agrees with Schweitzer in his interpretation of Jesus; that is, for him the Kingdom was to come in his own lifetime as a final cosmic catastrophe. But, says Seaver: "Jesus did not, as both liberal and Catholic expositors have too easily supposed, idealize the current messianic expectation by projecting it into a distant and indeterminate future, vaguely denominated as 'spiritual'; he regarded it as imminent and likely to occur at any moment."⁹

Then he quotes Schweitzer: "Whereas for his contemporaries it was a question of waiting for the Kingdom, of excogitating and depicting every incident of the great catastrophe: for Jesus it was a question of bringing to pass the expected event through moral renovation."¹⁰ And so he began his ministry: "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Again Seaver quotes: "Our minds refuse at first to grasp that a religiousness and an ethic so deep and spiritual can be combined with other views of such naïve realism. But the combination is a fact."¹¹

"It is to be noted," says Seaver, "that Schweitzer does not use the term supernatural to describe the personality of Jesus. He uses the term 'superhuman,' to connote, not a difference in kind, but a difference of degree." Would Schweitzer not say with Tennyson in *Locksley Hall Sixty Years After*, "The highest Human Nature is divine"?

The nature of the work of Christ is fully set forth in *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, his profoundest work. But it is already implicit in the closing sentence of *The Quest*: "To those who obey him, whether they be wise or simple, he will reveal himself in the toils, the conflicts,

⁸ Seaver, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

¹⁰ Schweitzer, *The Mystery of the Kingdom*, p. 115.

¹¹ Schweitzer, *Out of My Life and Thought*, p. 50.

the sufferings which they shall pass through in his fellowship, till, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience *Who he is.*"

Amid all the controversy over *The Quest*, Schweitzer takes no part. Somewhere he has said that he never attacks an opposing view but goes his way, drawing comfort from the words of St. Paul: "We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." Very appropriately Seaver concludes his chapter on *The Quest* with Schweitzer's words:

Because, while I was busied with the history of earlier Christianity, I had so often to deal with its sins against the truth of history, I have become a keen worker for honesty in our Christianity of today. . . . I find it no light task to follow my vocation—to put pressure on the Christian faith to reconcile itself in all sincerity with historical truth. But I am certain that truthfulness in all things belongs to the spirit of Jesus.¹²

Dr. Julius Seelye Bixler supports Schweitzer's position in clear and cogent language. Says he:

What we really gain from Jesus is a set of eternal truths which might have been set forth in any age. Not only is Jesus significant as a figure that transcends history, but his own views were mistaken and irrelevant. Does this suggest that he was wrong in his religious insight also? Not at all, says Schweitzer. What we respond to in Jesus is his teaching about love. Indeed, Schweitzer appears to go further and to say that Jesus' divinity is not interfered with by the fact that he was mistaken. . . . It appears to me that fundamentally Schweitzer is right in his approach to this whole problem and that his rightness is especially helpful today in the presence of the contemporary neo-orthodox movement, which would insist on our accepting all or nothing in the Christian tradition.¹³

In John Knox's recent book, *Christ the Lord*, there is an illuminating discussion of Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom of God. He finds three views prevalent today, and first cites Schweitzer as the best-known representative of the "consistent eschatologists" who hold that, when Jesus spoke of the Kingdom, he *always* meant that the end of the world was imminent at any moment and immediately thereafter would come a new order in which God's righteous purpose would be perfectly fulfilled. Schweitzer, therefore, uses the phrase "interim ethic" because of the strenuous and absolute character of Jesus' ethic, owing to his belief in the imminence of the great catastrophe.

Knox gives as the opposite extreme from Schweitzer's view the

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 67, 75.

¹³ Bixler, J. S., "Productive Tensions in the Work of Albert Schweitzer," in *The Albert Schweitzer Jubilee Book*, ed. by A. A. Roback. Cambridge: Sci-Art Publishers, 1946, 69ff. This book is a notable volume commemorating Schweitzer's seventieth birthday—reviewed by Dr. Edward H. Hume in *RELIGION IN LIFE*, Vol. XVI, 312ff.

liberal school, represented by Henry Burton Sharman. For them Jesus meant by the Kingdom simply the rule of God in so far as it was realized by men living under the normal conditions of human life. Those who acknowledge his kingship and seek to do his will already belong to his "Kingdom"; and this is, they hold, the only meaning the term has in Jesus' authentic teaching.

Knox mentions C. H. Dodd as the defender of the third position. Dodd holds, in effect, that Jesus meant chiefly the eternal, ultimate sovereignty of God, as in the phrase: "Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever," manifested in a unique and supreme way by Jesus' own life and works. "Jesus was not announcing a future event or referring to a future order; he was referring to an eternal Reality, there and then making itself active within history."

Knox's conclusion is that all three meanings can be found in the text and distinguished, although none of the three is really complete when it is separated from the others:

It is not necessary to choose among these three views. Jesus doubtless employed the phrase in all three senses. That Jesus was aware with every breath he drew of the eternal kingship of God, everyone will agree; that he believed that men could come even now in some real sense under the righteous and loving rule of God is almost equally clear, and only by the most tortuous methods of interpreting the Gospels, can one escape the conclusion that Jesus expected the kingdom as a future, supernatural order.¹⁴

IV

In addition to Dr. Joy's *Albert Schweitzer: An Anthology*, the Beacon Press is publishing another Schweitzer book this spring, entitled *Albert Schweitzer in Africa*, by Dr. Joy and Melvin Arnold. Last summer these two men visited Dr. Schweitzer in Africa, living with him throughout the month of July and taking more than 1,500 photographs of life at the Lambaréné hospital. While there they caught many intimate glimpses of the doctor—at work among his patients, writing letters at the close of day or working on the third volume of his *Philosophy of Civilization*, playing Bach on his pedal piano of an evening, or preaching on Sunday to his Lambaréné community.

Mrs. Schweitzer and the nurses help the doctor after hours with the gigantic self-imposed task of writing thank-you letters to the many friends and supporters of the hospital. Here is part of a letter, written to me in the

¹⁴ John Knox, *Christ the Lord*. Willett Clark, 1945, p. 30.

midst of the torrid heat of the wet season, dated February 24, 1946, from Nurse Emma Haussknecht. It reveals how the white staff of the hospital experience Dr. Schweitzer. She writes in English:

I have been working at Lambaréné for twenty years. . . . We are all awfully tired by the damp and hot climate, but dear Dr. Schweitzer is the most courageous of us all. After the day's duty he plays on the piano with organ pedals and from our rooms in the silence of the night and in the midst of the big forest we enjoy the most perfect recitals. These music hours are comfort and inner help. They have meant so much to me during the years of separation from home. . . . We can never forget the U. S. A. during the war. We cannot imagine the region here without the hospital and staff. The misery round us makes us keen to continue as long as our strength allows it. But we need a change of air and some rest. It will be a happy day when the young doctors are here to take the greatest part of the hospital work from Dr. Schweitzer.

A particularly intimate and profound way in which both the staff and the patients of the hospital, black and white, experience Albert Schweitzer, is the Sunday morning service. Shortly before nine in the morning, patients who can leave their beds begin to assemble, sitting quietly before the wards, in family groups, on stairs, cooking dinner, surrounded by goats, hens, ducks, etc. The doctor stands before one of the wards with an interpreter on each side. It seems fitting to conclude this article with one of his sermons, recorded at Lambaréné and translated by Dr. Joy.¹⁵

THE TORNADO AND THE SPIRIT (A Sermon by Albert Schweitzer)

I am going to speak to you today about the Holy Spirit. We see all around us trouble and strife, sickness and war. And we may well ask, "Why does not the Holy Spirit manifest itself today?"

Here is the great river behind us. In its upper reaches it is swift and tumultuous. There are turbulent currents and dangerous rapids. It is a savage stream. The river flows onward. The farther it flows the broader and stronger and more tranquil it becomes. The Holy Spirit is like that. At first there is very little sign of its presence in the savage hearts of men. But little by little it grows stronger and men become filled with it. Then it manifests its force in the hearts of men.

The great question for us is, "Do we have the Holy Spirit within us?" I am sure that the good God asks this question. The answer is that we have it, but not enough of it. We feel the Holy Spirit within us. We feel it as we feel the light breeze of the season on our faces.

¹⁵ By courtesy of Dr. Joy and Beacon Press, Boston.

It is difficult, of course, to open our hearts to the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is strange to us. It wishes to control our lives. It wishes to govern us in everything. In little things as in big things. And the sign of the Holy Spirit is the way in which we live. The Holy Spirit would prevent us from killing. It would prevent us from seeking revenge. It would rule our lives even in our own homes. We must seek to possess it.

The Holy Spirit is not the spirit of the ordinary man. It is the Spirit of God. The Holy Spirit means that we are not like the ordinary man. We become another kind of being. Indeed we must be born again, born for a second time, born again through the Holy Spirit.

We must ask ourselves, then, if we have been born for the second time. The evidence of the Holy Spirit in our lives is that no matter what other men do, we will do what we think is right. We must decide that we will be different from others. Every day we must fight to be patient, to be kind, to be good.

We do not know what the Holy Spirit is, but God has put it in our hearts. The Holy Spirit is really the will of God in our hearts. It is not the will of man. It is for us to will what is the will of God. Every day we must pray, "Give us the strength to do the will of the Holy Spirit." He who does not fight constantly against the will of man has not the Holy Spirit in his heart. Therefore, every one of you must strive to find out what he must do today, what he must do tomorrow, what he must do the day after tomorrow, to carry out the will of the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit brings happiness to our hearts. It is this that brings us peace. The spirit of man is like the tornado. Sometimes it comes from one quarter, sometimes from another, sometimes from a third, violent and destructive. The Holy Spirit is like the breeze that comes always from the same direction with its gentle, living strength. And we know it by the peace that it brings to our hearts. It brings us nearer to God. Strive to have and to keep the Holy Spirit, that you may have peace in your hearts.

Prayer: O God, we are poor people. We are feeble people. Give us the strength to live in the Holy Spirit. Give us the strength to fight for the Holy Spirit. Send thy Spirit into the world. So that all men may have thee in their hearts. And that peace may come to replace war upon the earth. So may thy kingdom begin in our hearts and in the hearts of all Christians everywhere. Send us peace by the Holy Spirit. Amen.

When the Heart Sings

CALVIN T. RYAN

The great hymns offer an educational and inspirational force for modern man and provide a real bond for the deepening of ecumenical unity.

HYMNS HAVE BEEN called the poor man's poetry, and are said to contain his theology. Hymns come home to men's hearts, and explain to them all they need to know about the science of religion. The "heart" often comprehends what the mind fails to grasp. For that reason what is sung into the consciousness of a child nothing can remove, although he may forget many things which are given to him through his mind. Often the real test of understanding is not "I know," but as Tennyson says, "I have felt." The Evangelical movement of the eighteenth century was grounded in the feelings of men, and traveled by the singing of hymns as much as by the preaching of the gospel.

The six-weeks' revival meetings of the early 1900's, like the summer camp meetings on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, depended much upon "gospel singing" of the congregation. Men and women, young and old, joined in "Rock of Ages," "Pass Me Not, O Gentle Savior," and "Stand Up, Stand Up for Jesus" without either knowing or caring who wrote them, or whether the authors were Protestant or Catholic, Baptist or Presbyterian. They experienced the "fineness" which George Herbert said hymns would afford,

If when the soul unto the lines accords.

All evangelical revivals from the time of the Great Awakening through Moody, Sankey, Billy Sunday, and Gypsy Smith have depended noticeably on congregational singing. The great hymns, no matter who wrote them, have gone home to men's hearts, and when sung by congregations have had power to stir, to make men and women "feel" as well as think. We can call it "the psychology of the mass," or "the mob"—group singing does bring men and women together who may be poles apart in creeds and rituals. "Religious song is an outpouring of human hearts," according to one writer; "often the deepest thoughts and feelings are unconsciously expressed."

Professor H. Augustine Smith says in his *Lyric Religion*, "Congregational singing is showing signs of weakening today," and he attributes

the weakening to "the sophistication of church people and their easily acquired habits of listening-in rather than participating. . . ." ¹ In more than one period in the history of the church, people have "listened in" rather than participated. During those periods congregational singing was frowned upon. During similar periods only the Psalms set to music were permitted. But with the rise of the Reformation, and of the belief that the Psalms gave the Old Testament view only, the hymn was returned to the congregation, and Luther's "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God" became almost a battle cry.

It might well be that back of the "sophistication of church people," and "the easily acquired habit of listening-in rather than participating," lies something deeper and more fundamental. For instance, the "feelings" have not been especially stressed in our modern thinking, and have been almost deleted from our education since the days of H. L. Mencken. Have we not rather gone on the assumption that man is born good but ignorant, and the all-important, if not the only essential, thing is to supply his few human wants and by some *modus operandi* remove his ignorance? Man's "feelings" are left undisciplined; yet we know that our feelings often determine our acts.

It is easy for church people to become "sophisticated" when their background is void of any knowledge of the difference between good and evil. The eighteenth century is referred to as the Age of Reason, even the Age of Enlightenment, but any evidence of the emotive side of life was frowned upon as lacking in decorum. It is easy, I say, to become "sophisticated" and not take part in congregational singing when we are saturated with religious individualism and surfeited with intellectual priorities.

In some of our evangelical church services, the minister no longer reads from either the Old Testament or the New. As a consequence even the regular communicants do not hear the Bible read. The last vestige of the heart appeal left is the hymns which the congregation are supposed to sing. The twenty-minute sermon may be scholarly, perhaps erudite, but rarely does it evoke a hearty Amen from what used to be called the Amen Corner. Could it be that fearfulness of being "enthusiastic" is raising its ugly head again? Could it be that H. L. Mencken did his work so thoroughly that the wellsprings of emotion have gone permanently dry?

¹ Fleming H. Revell Company, 1931, p. v.

The eighteenth was a century of strange paradoxes and inconsistencies. It was an age of decorum; an age of the Gentleman; an age of reason; an age of enlightenment. But it was also an age of interest in the common man; an age of feeling; an age of interest in animals, an age when women and children were beginning to receive more attention than in any previous age. It was the age not only of Pope and Johnson, but also of the Wesley brothers, Whitefield, and Lady Huntingdon. It was the great hymn-writing age. "A hymn may be the surest embodiment of the spirit of the times as well as of the writer," we are told. The statement is no more true of the Reformation in Germany than it is of the eighteenth century in Great Britain. The hymns of Watts, the Wesleys, Toplady, Robinson, and Cowper do embody the spirit of the times. They embody God's love for the sinner, they sing of Jesus' redemptive power. The common man came to feel that he had not been forgotten by God, even though he may have been ignored by the church and his king.

When the heart sings, the whole body vibrates and the world grows brighter. The Hebrews made much of song. They could not make graven images, but they could sing. They could not make their mark in either the military or the commercial world, but they could sing. They had a heart life, and it sustained them through ordeals which no other people have ever faced. Jehovah was their God. That refrain was sung into their consciousness and they never lost it. Somehow they sensed:

The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon him,
To all that call upon him in truth.

Paul and Silas in prison "at midnight prayed and sang praises unto God." The subtle influence of hymns has often been noted, not only upon the "prisoners," but also upon whole armies, upon men who have dropped in to scoff and remained to pray. The particular sect or denomination of the writer who composed the hymn matters little, not when what he has written takes hold of us. It doesn't matter whether the Rev. Edward Perronet wrote "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name" while he was still a member of the Established Church of England, or after he left the church and joined the Wesleys. (Presumably, Perronet wrote the hymn after he broke with the Wesleys and founded an independent church in Canterbury.) D. L. Moody loved the hymn, and often opened his services by having the congregation sing it.

In an age of materialism, at a time when all emphasis is placed upon the intellect and but little upon the heart; when men believe that

progress is inevitable, and that all suffering and want as well as all intellectual and spiritual problems depend upon science for solution, men are apt to think they are pious when they are only bilious. They are apt to rule out *feeling*, not knowing that to *feel right* about the right things is as important as to *think right* about them. The emphasis upon "ecumenical unity," taking it as it has come to be used since the famous Oxford Conference of 1937 on Church, Community, and State, has stressed "Christian solidarity in life and work throughout the inhabited globe." The science of Ecumenics is an outgrowth of the emphasis, and means a study of the Church Universal. It has to do with a common feeling among those who call themselves Christians. It is within the One World idea, but not the same as the One World concept. It is not the same as reunion of all sects and creeds, yet it may be instrumental in reducing the irreconcilable creeds.

This ecumenical unity is an appeal from within outwards. It is an effort to get all those who worship the one true God to think in unity, and to feel a common bond in a common and universal cause. It may involve more theology than the ordinary layman can grasp. It may be that many will have to be given the "milk" until they are ready for the "meat."

That is, we may have to resort to the poor man's theology—the hymn. We can grasp with the ear what we fail to get with the mind. We can "feel" our way into this unity. Something like that is what Lanier, the southern poet, meant when he wrote, "I know that I know." There is no sect or creed in "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," or in "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God." There is no English, no American in "God of Our Fathers, Known of Old." As John Oxenham wrote in 1908:

In Christ there is no East or West,
In him no South or North;
But one great fellowship of love
Throughout the whole wide earth.²

A Quaker poet, John Greenleaf Whittier, could write "Dear Lord and Father of Mankind." Twelve years before he became a Roman Catholic, John Henry Newman wrote one of the great hymns of all times, "Lead, Kindly Light." Fanny J. Crosby, blind from early infancy, could bless the world with her "Safe in the Arms of Jesus," "Pass Me Not, O Gentle Savior," and "Some Day the Silver Cord Will Break." Sarah Flower Adams, one time an actress, wrote "Nearer, My God, to

² From *Bees in Amber*, published and copyright by The American Tract Society. Used by permission.

Thee," the favorite of President McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt, and played by the ship's band as the "Titanic" went down. Anna Coghill at eighteen wrote "Work, for the Night Is Coming." Ray Palmer at twenty-two wrote "My Faith Looks Up to Thee."

Hymns are truly the universal language. Independent of age and experience, denomination or creed, sight or sightlessness, hymns are born of the spirit, and when they are truly great, they call to the spirit of man everywhere. They should be the great unifying source of Christians in this ecumenical unity.

The hymn can truly "go where nothing else can, and do what nothing else can." Luther and the Reformation were grounded in the heart life of the people. They believed their God was "A Mighty Fortress." Luther was devoted to his family, we are told, and when he gathered his wife and six children around him, "he led them in singing." Luther's hymns were sung by the artisans at their work. Perhaps the Roman Catholics were, from their point of view, absolutely right when they declared, "Luther's songs have damned more souls than all his books and speeches."

Getting a people to sing is a matter of no small importance. It is a sure way to get them to feel. And feeling is very important, for it eventually goes over into action. Furthermore, there is a certain wisdom of the ages in our grand old hymns. As Charles Clayton Morrison wrote recently: "The wisdom of the sage is derived from life itself, not from the scientist's abstract analysis of life." Asking, Where has it been tried? and Where has it been proved? would intimate that there is only one kind of knowledge, and that is the kind found by the scientist. However strange it may seem, there is much wisdom in the Bible, and it was put there before the scientific age of "knowing" was born.

The Wesley hymns, for example, make liberal use of the words of Scripture; they stress salvation, and the redemption of the world by Jesus. But they also show that the authors were acquainted with contemporary and classic literature. The men who wrote them had a classic education. A contemporary of the Wesleyan movement, not too favorably inclined, wrote of the singing of the Evangelicals:

And, as to their Singing, they, perhaps, have got some of the most melodious Tunes that ever were composed for Church Music; there is great Harmony in their Singing, and it is very enchanting.

After commending the singing for what it was worth, this writer then adds:

I say very enchanting; because the Hymns they Sing, i.e., all I have seen or heard of, are not rational Compositions, nor do they accord with the first Principles of all Religion, but like their Prayers, dwell upon a Word, or are immediate addresses to the Son of God, as the supreme Object of Worship. And do represent him as much more friendly and compassionate to the human World than God the Father ever was—so that their Singing is calculated to engage the Passions by nothing more than Words, and the Melody of the Sound, or Voice. . . .³

That is just the point! The hymns of the Evangelical movement were not "rational Compositions," and since they were not rational in an age of Reason and Decorum, obviously they violated "the first Principles of all Religion," which were Deistic. The great hymns of both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were not intended, like Macaulay's comment on Lord Bacon, "to make imperfect men comfortable." More nearly they made imperfect men realize that God the Father is "friendly and compassionate to the human world."

Professor Kenneth Scott Latourette, writing of contemporary American Christianity, says: "There were indications that the increasing proportion of church membership was paralleled by a growing illiteracy among a majority of those owing to this connection."⁴ As numbers in our churches have increased, so has religious illiteracy. That is, the church has failed in recent years to educate its own membership. Religion as "good works" omitted certain basic doctrines, and followers became spiritually illiterate. The pendulum must swing back.

The great hymns of the church never permit us to forget our debt to God, or our reliance upon a Savior. The Old Rugged Cross is not an easy way of living for those who think, if given time, education and science will remove its ruggedness. "Nearer, My God, to Thee" is neither the prayer nor the song of an "imperfect man" who expects to be comfortable.

If "the Melody of Sound" can be used to "engage the passions" of men and women, the church will be wise to use it in an effort to educate its followers in spiritual literacy. The singing of "God Bless America" may be well and good, but we had better make sure that we are worthy of his blessing. It is better to sing into our very lives that great hymn, "Lead, Kindly Light." It is imperative that our prayer be:

Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget.

³ John Scott, *A Fine Picture of Enthusiasm*, London, 1744. Quoted in Umphrey Lee, *The Historical Backgrounds of Early Methodist Enthusiasm*, Columbia University Press, 1931.

⁴ *Advance Through Storm*. Harper & Brothers, 1945, p. 125.

The little boy's definition of the saints as "the men the light shines through" may be too reminiscent of the stained-glass windows in his cathedral, but he spoke an eternal truth, as children for some unexplainable reason so often do. Among such saints, the light has never shone through more brilliantly, more beautifully, or more effectively than it has through the men and women of the ages who have given us our great hymns. Through those inspired writers the Word has been made flesh and dwelt among us. The missionary movement of the nineteenth century gave us one of those writing saints, so that through his hymns the Word was made flesh. Bishop Heber's "From Greenland's Icy Mountains" was a trumpet-call. Lord Tennyson, the poet laureate of England, called "Holy, Holy, Holy" the world's greatest hymn. The third in what has been called Tennyson's "trinity," we know as "The Son of God Goes Forth to War."

It was this same Tennyson (another of those men through whom "the light shines") who when others placed their faith in "the age of marvels," an age when Natural Science and Natural Religion were to make progress inevitable, stood up and protested with all his throbbing spirit that man is

Not only cunning casts in clay:
Let Science prove we are, and then
What matters science unto men,
At least to me? I would not stay.*

Any talk of ecumenical unity must be made in a language that all can understand. The language of the heart is that language, and its most potent form is the hymn. Dryden asked, "What passion cannot music raise and quell?" Music can excite our feelings. It can also guide and control them. It may be true as Professor Edward Dickinson says, that "The office of music is not to suggest concrete images, or even to arouse definite namable sentiments, but rather to intensify ideas and feelings already existing. . . ." ⁶ It is none the less unifying, whereas creeds and round-table discussions may be divisive. Great hymns, time-tested classics of the spirit, do not have to be rendered into Basic English; they have a way of going where nothing else can go. They are in themselves ecumenical; that is, in the etymological use of the word.

Children in the Cheddar Sunday Schools, established by Hannah More in the late eighteenth century, were taught to sing hymns. They

⁶ *In Memoriam*, cxx.

* *Music in the History of the Western Church*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902-08, pp. 396f.

were taught to read the Bible, of course, and some practical activities, but the unifying force which broke down opposition and made friends for the schools seems to have been their group singing. An account of one of the Sunday-school "feasts" is preserved in *The Bath Chronicle* for August 22, 1793. The account estimates that "near one thousand children" were in the entertainment, and that "not less than ten thousand persons" were present. At a certain point in the parade, the "children (conducted by their respective teachers) burst into songs of praise to their Maker, and paraded round the fence, singing hymns with that fervent and artless simplicity which touched the heart and roused the tear of sensibility in the eyes of all present."

Such happenings must have intensified "ideas and feelings already existing," not alone in the children but also in the remaining thousands of adults. Is it any wonder that we have since been told, "These schools raised the general culture of the English people and also affected the politics of the nation"? ⁷

A somewhat different attitude toward life, and toward ecumenical unity, is expressed in a recent article by a Dr. Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, a Buddhist of Japan, in the *Far East Stars and Stripes Weekly Review*. In closing his four-column article, Dr. Suzuki says:

My firm conviction is that a world-peace can never be brought about on earth so long as there remains the slightest notion of power-politics governing international relations, and that the replacement of the power-concept is possible only by a mutual spiritual understanding of all peoples. To this Buddhism has as much to contribute as does Christianity. Christians must try to understand Buddhists in the same way as the latter must the former.

After asserting that Christians are more aggressive, militant, and self-assertive than Buddhists, the writer says the latter are more peace-loving than the former, and that the Buddhists think the affairs of this world not really worth their serious attention; "let the world go wherever it is destined to; that is, to its own destruction, for this is its Karma." For Christians that is a "hard saying." If Buddhism has as much to offer toward "spiritual understanding of all people" as Christianity has, then the two religions are not using the word "spiritual" in the same way. We cannot "let the world go wherever it is destined to"; certainly not and carry out the Great Commission. Obviously no Buddhist could sing "The Son of God Goes Forth to War." Greenland's icy mountains are of no concern to a Buddhist, but of great concern to a

⁷ Mary Alden Hopkins, *Hannah More and Her Circle*. Longmans, Green & Co., 1947, p. 161.

Christian. Whittier's "Dear Lord and Father of Mankind" seems a better prayer for "spiritual understanding of all peoples" than any the Buddhists might offer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind,
Forgive our feverish ways;
Reclothe us in our rightful mind;
In purer lives thy service find,
In deeper reverence, praise.

Apparently not many great hymns have been written during the first half of the twentieth century. At least not many have been added to our church hymnals. We may have had religious poetry, some near-hymns, but what Bishop Quayle said of some devotional literature he did not like may apply to these poems; that is, they are religious platitudes "which lack locomotion." A hymn should have a purpose. It should go somewhere. One soon realizes that the theme of the Wesley hymns is Salvation, and Salvation for all the world. And in developing his theme the author speaks the language which reaches the spirit. This language is given wings; it has locomotion.

Perhaps it is well enough that hymns are slow in making the hymnals. It is commendable that hymns are not put out commercially, like so many anthologies of verse, to be studied by high-school and college students. From the time of Calvin to the present we have taken our hymns seriously. We seem to give each one the test of a classic; that is, the test of time. Poetry of the finest type may be in the poem, as it is in "Lead, Kindly Light," but fine poetry alone is not enough to assure the poem's being accepted for a hymnal, and labeled a hymn to be sung by a congregation. Augustine's definition of a hymn as "a song of praise to God" is not adequate. St. Paul leaves the impression that in the early church singing had the purpose of "teaching and admonishing one another." This teaching element seems difficult to get into a poem that is both singable and soul-stirring. The element that intensifies ideas and feelings "already existing" is not given words and music by however efficient poetasters.

Furthermore, when we remember that prior to World War II *feelings* were belittled, and literature with sentiment was frowned upon, we realize the atmosphere for devotional literature was not conducive to any high rate of productivity. We were apparently willing to succumb to the belief that material improvements automatically and inseparably carried with them moral perfection. The belief being false, those who

succumbed were misled. Salvation of the world was not worth singing about. There being something personal about a hymn, yet something of such universal appeal that groups can sing it, it is not easy to embody a social gospel. Walt Whitman could write "I sing of Myself," and we read his poetry without being too mindful of the author. It has a universality of appeal. The subjectivity of Wordsworth's poetry is not offensive, for we read it and read ourselves into it. Likewise with David, we can pray, "Bring my soul out of prison," and mean ourselves. Likewise we can sing singly or in groups:

He breaks the power of canceled sin,
He sets the prisoner free;
His blood can make the foulest clean,
His blood availed for me.

But when the law for man is reduced to a par with the law for things, things are bound to get into the saddle "and ride mankind," as has happened in recent decades. When that happens any talk of ecumenical unity, any inspiration for writing hymns, is minimal.

The period between our two World Wars was not a time of much Bible reading; and great writers of great hymns have invariably been God and Bible-saturated. It could well be that the latter half of our century will produce some great hymns. Sentiment is now no longer feared. Writers are once again appealing to readers' sensibilities. Unquestionably there is more interest on the part of young and old in reading the Bible. It is, as Tennyson wrote, not our ability to stand up and proclaim, "I know," so much as to stand up and say, "I feel." For those reasons, we may find it conceivable that God is getting ready to inspire another hymn writer.

Music, both sacred and secular, has been used by nations to further their political ends. Is it not true that following the first production of Auber's opera *Masaniello* in Brussels the audience, incited by its revolutionary spirit, rushed into the streets and started the revolt that terminated in the separation of Belgium from Holland? I believe the record is reliable that the wars for Italian independence started after the performance of Verdi's *I Lombardi*, on February 11, 1843. It was Napoleon Bonaparte who said, "Of all the liberal arts, music has the greatest influence over the emotions, and is the art to which the lawmaker should give great attention."

Returning to our theme of hymns and ecumenical unity, I see no

reason why this form of sacred music cannot be used for intensifying the unity in which the church, all Christendom, is now becoming interested. If it be true that lawmakers "should give great attention" to music, it is not too much to believe that the lawmakers of our church, that religious leaders everywhere should be concerned with this medium. Though bread may be rated the staff of life, we are told on equally good authority that man cannot live by bread alone. There is a place for the hymn as there is a place for the loaf of bread.

The Council of Nicaea may have gone on record as believing that Christian creeds were intended "to remove all grounds of difference and to wind up by laws of peace every link of controversy," but we find them often proving divisive. That is true of all statements of belief down through the years, as is illustrated even by the great international meeting in San Francisco at which the United Nations became a fact. Subsequent events have shown that ideologies have complicated consequences. Our Christian hymns, on the other hand, having been "virtuously and Christianly brought up," are by their nature unifying.

Beginning with the Reformation writers, who sang people "into Protestantism," coming on through the Evangelicals, the Wesleyan Revival, the Fanny Crosbys, and the Rudyard Kiplings, we find the hymn speaking to people's hearts. We can almost call it the word made flesh, and say that it has dwelt among us. The great hymns transcend sect and denomination. They are the people's poetry, and the people's theology; and because they are, they can still be used as a medium in ecumenical unity.

A Review of the Quarter's Fiction

JOHN C. SCHROEDER

OCCASIONALLY a novel appears which is unusually impressive. Such a story is *Cry, The Beloved Country*. Actually the plot is simple. The Rev. Stephen Kumalo is a minister of the Anglican Church in South Africa. He sees his own people leaving the land, which had once been lush and productive, for the more lucrative living they can find in Johannesburg and in the mines. The members of his own family have gone away. He learns that his sister, searching for her husband, is in trouble in the city, and, with his few savings, he leaves home to go in search of her. This simple, humble Zulu man of God arrives in this strange world to find that his brother has become an unprincipled rabble-rouser, his sister a harlot, and his son a murderer. Separated from the disciplines of the tribe, they had lost their very being in the city's anonymity.

The son had killed a man named Jarvis, who had been a courageous champion of the black people. The elder Jarvis was a wealthy landowner whose holdings were near Kumalo's own parish. The two fathers come to know one another through their mutual tragedy which ultimately redeems them both.

In the background is to be seen the torture and agony of South Africa, with both the people and the land ravaged and rootless. The reader is led to an understanding much deeper than a sociological comprehension of what is happening there. One of my missionary friends who knows South Africa well tells me that it is ripe for communism, which just now has many more enthusiastic protagonists than the Christian mission. Tragically, communism will never give the native what Christianity can; but our lethargic interest there may soon reveal that the church has come with too little, too late.

Certainly the hates and bitterness of the racial conflict cannot be resolved by economic measures alone. The hurt goes too deep to be met by anything but men of such deep compassionate dignity as Mr. Kumalo. He is a wonderful person of authentic humility, great enough to be capable of suffering. The prose of the book is as simple and direct, its cadence as steady and pure, as the man himself. Surely one of the purposes of fiction is to portray not only life in situations, but the deeper motives and comprehensions which make it truly human and

consequently truly tragic. *Cry, The Beloved Country* is such a novel. It is neither sentimental nor lacrymose, even though it reveals how deep is the hurt of the world and how bitter its travail.

The Ides of March is deft, civilized writing, revealing an author who knows what it is to be a philosopher and who is urbane enough to smile at human frailty and to probe human weakness without blanching or condoning. This is a story of Caesar and his coterie, involved in a scandalous episode which touches off the social upheaval that ends in his assassination. This little coterie are those who live at the top of Rome's social heap. Mr. Wilder takes liberties with history's chronology; but his story must be essentially true however far from fact it may be.

The people in this group are varied and interesting. Cleopatra is shrewd and furtive. Her sharp political perception is forever blurred by her love for Caesar. The woman in her betrays the politician. Cicero is sour and captious. Pompeia, Caesar's third wife, is a silly bewildered doll. Clodia Pulcher and her brother represent café society. They live only for a thrill whatever the cost in personal or social probity. Only two people in this crowd have any integrity: Aunt Lucia Marcia, who is an aristocrat, understanding what noblesse oblige means, and Clytheris, an actress, whose artistry lifts her above the tawdriness of those who live only for wealth.

Mr. Wilder's Caesar is interesting. He has been dictator for so long that he has been able to live above the human struggle. He is a skeptic who wonders about man's place in the universe. "Am I sure that there is no mind behind our existence and no mystery anywhere in the universe? . . . How terrifying and glorious the role of man if, indeed, without guidance and without consolation he must create from his own vitals the meaning for his existence and write the rules whereby he lives." He is able to transcend the politician's level. "A politician is one who pretends that he is subject to the universal hunger for esteem; but he cannot successfully pretend this unless he is free of it." He can even be tolerant about his enemies; not because he is truly benign but because he can view them as lesser mortals.

Caesar is envious of only one man—the poet. Catullus is truly the hero of the novel, for while he has his illusions and is duped by Clodia, he can love and not count the cost.

The Ides of March is a charming urbane book, obviously the work of a man who loves scholarship and who can write beautiful prose. He

delights in detecting the deep motives of people, to look down upon their silly pretenses and to find pleasure in the view, rather than to be made cynical by it.

Eagle At My Eyes is a story about anti-Semitism, which fails to make the reader sympathetic with the protagonists. Joe Goodman is a bright young lad, intensely in love with Mary. When he finds that she may marry another man, he marries her, to find that his whole family turns against him. Here is revealed the clannish Jewish family, feeling that their son has betrayed them. Joe is not ready to accept the inflexibilities of Jewish orthodoxy and particularity, but neither is he ready to accept Gentile prejudice, nor are they ready to accept him. Mary is so tolerant, she loses all distinction. The book attempts to bludgeon the reader, with the result that he is too bruised to see how cruel and how subtly torturing anti-Semitism can be. Only the father is human enough to rise above the mean angers of racial prejudice. Everyone else tries to barge through a delicate web of human relationships only to destroy them as he crushes them.

The Professor's Umbrella is about anti-Semitism too. Here the setting is a large Midwestern university. The people in it are all petty, scheming, ambitious pedants. The academic community does not come off too well in Miss Ward's story. Gregory Kitner, a Jewish professor of English, is an honest scholar. His intimate friends, Tom and Mary Dawson, have no integrity and are ready to sacrifice conscience at the drop of the president's handkerchief. Amy, Gregory's mistress, has plenty of money and a meretricious culture. Professor Goldwater is a crusader for social justice, but is all too ready to sacrifice almost any truth for a cause.

The book disturbs one by bringing home the realization of anti-Semitism in a university community; but what is more disturbing is the shallowness and Philistinism of the life. No love of the good life can conceivably be nurtured in a place where such people are responsible for its health.

Lucinda Brayford is a fine example of first-rate storytelling. I get startled when I see it compared with Galsworthy. It's not as good as that. But its craftsmanship is excellent and its prose interesting. It is a study in dissolution. Even when the British aristocracy is strengthened by colonial wealth and vigor, it cannot withstand the forces against it. The trouble is that the plutocratic colonials' snobbery is worse than the aristocracy's impotence. Only one person, Lucinda's son Stephen,

really has integrity. Lord Crittenden is an honest Tory. His younger brother Paul, as a spokesman for the old order, seems silly. Lucinda herself should have remained in Australia. At least there, she might have retained some of the strength which made her father rich. One is ready to see such a feudal aristocracy go, but one is saddened by the realization that its best protagonists had a sense of responsibility which is not found in contemporary society.

That Winter attempts to tell what happened to the veteran when he came home. This particular trio in New York: Peter, Lew, and Ted, tried to subsist on alcohol and sex. Peter worked for a weekly news magazine, Lew wrote script for the radio, and Ted lived on his family's money. Their readjustment to civilian life was violent and finally each in his own way rebelled. Ted did it by suicide, Lew by facing the fact that he was a Jew, and Peter by quitting a job whose hypocrisies and infidelities forced his conscience to honesty. These men are not typical. They represent the sophisticated intellectual. Their attempt at integrity about themselves and their world consisted in not doing what they did not want to do. Nevertheless, we can too easily forget how war shocked young men, so that they are restless and insecure and don't know what to think. Superficially they have found their place in the world; but many of them still suffer spiritually, not knowing what to believe nor what they can commit themselves to. *That Winter* was a bad year. It will take many more to cure the hurt.

Cry, The Beloved Country. By ALAN PATON. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. pp. 278. \$3.00.

The Ides of March. By THORNTON WILDER. New York: Harper & Brothers. pp. 246. \$2.75.

Eagle At My Eyes. By NORMAN KATKOV. New York: Doubleday & Co. pp. 252. \$2.75.

The Professor's Umbrella. By MARY JANE WARD. New York: Random House. pp. 313. \$3.00.

Lucinda Brayford. By MARTIN BOYD. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. pp. 439. \$3.00.

That Winter. By MERLE MILLER. New York: William Sloane Associates. pp. 297. \$3.00.

Book Reviews

God Confronts Man in History. By HENRY SLOANE COFFIN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947. pp. 154. \$2.50.

Since his retirement as president of Union Theological Seminary in New York, Henry Sloane Coffin has been an exceedingly active man. In his capacity as Joseph Cook lecturer for the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., he has visited in succession the principal cities of the Philippine republic, China, India, and Siam lecturing "in defense of Christianity." Since "an exposition appeared the best defense" these addresses in fact cover most of the basic Christian convictions. Emphasis was placed on the activity of God in history, which had the double advantage of rendering the Gospel *prima facie* relevant to our troubled world and at the same time bringing out clearly "the distinctive nature of the Christian revelation." The present volume is a collection of these lectures.

An account of the tour and the miscellaneous circumstances under which Dr. Coffin lectured is given in the first chapter. He spoke before businessmen, government officials, physicians, educators, and once in China to some three hundred soldiers "seated on wooden benches in the middle of a wind-and-dust-swept parade ground on a bitter November morning." He flew across hostile battle lines to meet his engagement in Tsinanfu, celebrating there the Generalissimo's sixtieth birthday. His meetings were often presided over by native non-Christian leaders, and once—at Nanking—by General Marshall.

Addressing the pantheistic Hindu mind, which doubts that God in any special way can become involved in "mere transitory events," the lecturer spoke of "God in History" and of "God's Self-Revelation"—of "the Jesuslikeness of God," of Jesus as "the image of the invisible God." Before those who believe, according to a well-known saying of one of the *swami*, "The most sinful thing is to call men sinful," he declared "God's Redemptive Work." To the heirs of Lao-tze, Confucius and Mencius, Dr. Coffin indicated Jesus' distinctive quality and power "to create a more delicate conscience." To the Christians of South India who, in the author's opinion, have effected "the most significant ecclesiastical development among the heirs of the Reformation since that disintegrating event," he opened the possibility of reversed missionary activity to those in the west who "hive off by themselves under the guise of devotion to liturgical or nonliturgical forms, or to particular doctrines or modes of Church order, when social snobbery is the hidden motive." The significance of this volume for an American reader will be found not so much in what is said as in the foil provided by remembering these and other contrasts, and in the self-knowledge to be gained by attending to those other worlds in which Dr. Coffin's words were first spoken.

PAUL RAMSEY

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

Tomorrow Is Here. By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE and W. RICHEY HOGG. New York: The Friendship Press. pp. xiv-145. \$1.50 (paper 90¢).

There is always a great gap between even the most significant gathering of Christian leaders and the ministry and members of the churches they represent.

This book does a remarkable job of bridging the gap between the meeting last July at Whitby, Ontario, and the church at large. It was written to do just that. The meeting was a postwar conference called by the International Missionary Council. Matters of the greatest importance to the next stage of world Christian advance were brought under scrutiny and broad policies agreed upon.

Following the trend begun at Jerusalem in 1928 the "younger churches" were well represented. Indeed, this seems to have been a sort of turning point at which real equality and comradeship between the older and the younger churches was achieved. A striking evidence of this lies in the fact that delegates from the two groups meeting separately and without collusion arrived at identical decisions regarding the future strategy of the work of missions. It may be summed up in the assertion that vastly greater numbers of missionaries must be sent by the older churches to all parts of the world, and, on the other hand, that the younger churches must assume more and more self-support and self-direction. Such a policy results from the fact that the Christian population in most countries is still a small minority and there is a staggering task of pioneer missionary work to be done.

"Expectant Evangelism" was the phrase that emerged and that characterized the central emphasis of the meeting. Even the old—and honored—slogan, "the evangelization of the world in this generation," was heard. This, after all, is a return to realism in Christian missions. The basic task has yet to be done of winning men to faith in Christ and commitment to his ways. The Great Commission was heard again, and it was pointed out that the content of that commission is an evangelism to the whole man; not merely to baptize all peoples, but also to teach them to *observe* and *do* all that Christ has taught us. As to accomplishing it in this generation, perhaps that is impossible, but the only way to go at such a fundamental and compelling task is to act and think as though we had only this generation in which to do it. After all, that is all the time *this* generation has. This emphasis upon evangelism seems to box the compass of the old and unprofitable conflict between humanitarian service and conversion in the conception of Christian missions. Any valid evangelism is both.

This little book not only gives a vivid and effective account of the personalities and doings at Whitby but it is really an up-to-the-minute account of the state of the world movement of Christianity. The present state of the church in various countries, the form of the modern missionary enterprise, the place of missions in the ecumenical movement, the essential apologetic for missions, the problems and the present stage of their solution attendant upon the communication of the Christian faith and life to the non-Christian world, the special difficulties and opportunities resulting from World War II—all these matters are embraced in this little volume with beguiling lack of ponderousness.

The book is composed of short chapters, and there are suggested questions for each chapter to facilitate use of the book for forums or discussions. The material is of such a character as to make it usable in this way. There is enough concrete information to give a factual basis and a continuous presentation of the ideas and issues to give direction to discussion.

One of the most valuable chapters, "The Eternal Gospel Realized in Life," contains the brief stories of a number of delegates who became Christians by conversion from non-Christian faiths. These sketches are exceedingly well done. They ought to remind the church of today that the experience of finding God in Christ is still a new and wonderful thing and that the majority of men are still

far from it. The conversion of a European from secularism is put side by side with that of an Indian from Islam and a Chinese from Confucianism.

The book will take its readers to Whitby and into the fellowship of the World Church there realized, and then it will take them out in the world itself to the frontiers in thought and action of evangelical Christianity.

HUGH VERNON WHITE

Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California.

Society, Culture, and Personality. By PITIRIM A. SOROKIN. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. xiv-742. \$7.50.

Sorokin has been startling a complacent sociological world for a generation with ponderous yet readable volumes setting forth the partiality of modern social science. Anyone who has read his *Contemporary Sociological Theories* and the four-volume *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, or even the summary of the latter work for the layman, *The Crisis of Our Age*, has felt the irresistible force of his criticism. Modern sociology is as sensate in its presuppositions as the prevailing mentality of the last four hundred years. Externalism and modern sociology are identical. But the prophets of Baal have underestimated Elijah. This volume continues and develops systematically the Sorokin theme, that sociology, properly considered, is the study of the superorganic world, the cosmos of the human spirit.

Sorokin is a philosopher, a fact bitterly lamented by sensate sociologists, but in the endeavor to dismiss him as a theorist his opponents have failed to take into account the solid empirical basis of his work. The purely empirical studies upon which his conclusions rest can only be adequately described as partaking of the "quantitative colossalism" he has found characteristic of our declining sensate culture. Yet, as he has recognized, the causo-functional or empirical approach must always yield partiality unless it is supplemented by the logico-meaningful method. Facts, without analysis and interpretation, are worthless. And the facts of consciousness, the inner data of human experience, usually overlooked by sensory sociologists, here come into their own as necessary parts of a total view. It should be clear enough that a halting externalism in social science, intent upon amassing statistics, but drawing back in cowardice from reaching meaningful conclusions, is finally irrelevant. The problem of human survival upon this planet cannot wait for a timorous and peripheral sociology.

"Even now, when a quantitative and qualitative increase of solidarity in mankind means life or death to humanity, when without such an increase nothing can prevent future world wars with their apocalyptic destruction, we have thousands of special research institutes examining all sorts of matters, often quite unimportant, but we do not have a single research institute in the world dedicated to the problems of solidarity and antagonism."

Two factors, according to Sorokin, permanently qualify human behavior: the total sociocultural universe in which an individual is embedded, on the one hand, and the liberty of the individual in selection and creativity on the other. Our old friends, freedom and necessity, greet us again in this volume. Human life is a paradox still. The individual may drift to the negative polarization; he may become "eclectic, superficial, characterless," or "plastic and cynical," or "neurotic, melancholic, and paranoiac." Contrariwise the individual may polarize positively; he may become "religious, saintly, ascetic, and stoic," expand his "mental and

cultural vistas," enrich his "ideological, behavioral, and material culture, and even create a new system from the diverse elements" in his unintegrated environment. Yet the individual's freedom is relative to the total of his confronting alternatives. He does not pursue his life journey in a vacuum but within "the gigantic socio-cultural processes" which surround him. Basically his encompassing universe will be familistic, compulsory, contractual, or mixed. The familistic society possesses a virtually complete integration of values, a harmony established chiefly by spiritual and social unity. The compulsory society achieves a specious unity by coercion. The contractual society—our own?—is a religious and cultural chaos, a syncretism, a hodgepodge of unrelated elements, united by "spatial adjacency" and by legal or business contracts—a society of egoism and antagonism.

Our age seems blessed, and irritated, by two major prophets—Sorokin, a Russian-American, and Toynbee, an Englishman. By diverse paths both have come to one conclusion—schism in the soul leads to political and economic breakdown. Both are convinced that familistic resurrection can come only through spiritual integration. "At the present moment this universe is in the midst of a vast transformation. So also are the souls and actions of its human members. Let us hope that the great passage to a new and integrated society will be made without additional tragedy or apocalyptic catastrophe."

DAVID WESLEY SOPER

Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin.

Not By Might. By A. J. MUSTE. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. 227. \$2.50.

Not By Might is a statement of the absolute pacifist position as the only alternative to World War III and the end of human civilization. "God and history have us cornered now." The author, Executive Secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, applies to various areas of life the thesis that thoroughgoing Christian pacifism offers the only possibility of man's survival in an atomic age. This is done with fervency and vigor. The appearance of the word "atomic" in five of the eleven chapter headings depicts the nature and imminence of the present threat demanding immediate pacifist action.

Emphasis is rightly put upon the primacy of the will of God and the moral rightness of the end purposes of the universal order. The only means coherent with these ends, however, as well as the only ones which offer any escape from extinction are the embrace of absolute pacifist principles by "several million conscientious objectors," the dismantling of all existent atomic bombs and the cessation of their manufacture, complete disarmament by the United States "unilaterally—at once," the repentant renunciation of war-making as a national policy, the sending of missions of mercy to the needy throughout the world, and the building of the necessary world organizations in all areas of society. The alternatives are world domination by a single power, continued reliance upon armaments, world government, and atomic death. As an American addressing Americans, the author proposes that the United States adopt the pacifist program and become "a savior-nation."

That this proposal is Christian is defended by identifying "the moral life, the life of 'conscience' (with) the religious life," and by numerous citations of the teachings and example of Jesus. One chapter deals explicitly with "the man

on the cross against the atomic bomb." The reader is never in doubt as to the writer's commitment to the Christian faith and way as the ground of his view of man, history, morality, and politics. But one senses that the author has a warmer kinship of spirit for the non-Christian pacifist than he has for the non-pacifist Christian (e.g., Gandhi versus Niebuhr).

Tactically, the strength of the book is its outrightness. There is no minimizing of the moral outrage in our use of the atomic bomb on defenseless cities. "It is worse to kill others with the atomic bomb than to be killed by it." "Repentance begins at home." "Pacifism may very well result in the 'crucifixion' of the nation embracing it." "Non-violence 'coerces' and will likely inflict suffering on others." The weaknesses are an inconsistency in the handling of materials, a lack of progressive structure, and an overload of question marks. There is no organizational pattern suggested for the pacifist world order. It is to be "democratic," though the right of the majority to decide for the minority is elsewhere denied.

In keeping with his theory that "a moderate or 'sensible' program for general consumption is psychologically unsound," since it produces apathy by its very inadequacy, Dr. Muste here issues the moral and spiritual appeal for peace in its full revolutionary ultimacy. "The way that Jesus taught and lived is in fact the only way that makes sense any more." Peace is primarily an attitude of the spirit and is to be achieved "not by might" but by "love against the atomic bomb."

GERALD O. McCULLOH

Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.

Man as Sinner in Contemporary Realistic Theology. By MARY FRANCES THELEN. New York: King's Crown Press, 1946. pp. xii-223. \$2.75.

This study is the published form of a dissertation in fulfillment of the requirements for the doctoral degree in Philosophy at Columbia University. The author is Assistant Professor of Religion at Hollins College, Virginia.

Miss Thelen's work calls for high commendation for at least two reasons. The first is that she has undertaken to interpret what has been going on in American theological thought during the last decade and a half; to be exact, since 1932. This is a bold enterprise, since all the theologians who appear in the major portion of the monograph are still fashioning their own positions. But the author has stayed well within the limits imposed by this fact and provided a first-rate account of books and people who are shaping contemporary theology, and whose contemporaries are, on that account, likely to miss the synoptic significance of their work. Miss Thelen's synopsis is carefully limited to the doctrine of man as sinner. And one comes away from these pages with an informed sense of an emerging pattern in American theology which is an important contribution to theological learning, not because it is "American" but because the pattern shows that Christian thinkers in America are actively wrestling with the problem of the Christian faith and contemporary culture. The second merit of this study is its thorough documentation. A handbook has been made available to anyone who really wants to know accurately and conveniently what is being thought in America today about the problem of sin. In both these respects, I have already found Miss Thelen's work very useful indeed, and wish to thank her for it.

These pages, moreover, are not limited to the circle of theological scholars. There are two major parts to the book. Part One deals with the background for

the rise of realistic theology as indicated by the work of Tennant, Hocking, and Harrison Elliott (more or less within the Christian tradition), and such secular theories of human nature as are provided by Marx and Freud. Part Two reviews the writings of Reinhold and Richard Niebuhr, Walter Horton, Robert Calhoun, and John Bennett, and concludes with a chapter summarizing "the realistic doctrine of man as sinner." Structurally regarded, this last chapter might advantageously have been included as Part Three. Such a division would have helped the reader to distinguish more effectively Miss Thelen's interpretation of the doctrine of sin from her interpretation of the theologians themselves. It would also have drawn more attention to her own evaluation of the study, which is disappointingly brief. The author dissents, for example, from the way the realistic theologians relate their definition of sin to the perfection of God's will, on the one hand, and to the actual possibilities of life, on the other. But she says merely that she has a "quarrel" with this tendency. She also thinks that these theologians should be more thorough about their understanding and use of psychoanalysis, without meaning to suggest that theology "is to become a derivative subject." But she does not help us much to see how to meet her objection by illustrating her point with reference to the doctrine of salvation, since her book is about the doctrine of sin. The reader will not, however, be deprived, by the lack of an adequate critical discussion, of the ample reward of a conscientious and able exposition.

PAUL LEHMANN

Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

The Christian Doctrine of Grace. By OSCAR HARDMAN. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. pp. 128. \$2.00.

This is a liberal Catholic book against the orthodox Protestant position, as conceived and maligned by the author. Since this position is already in disrepute, one is not sure why Dr. Hardman felt impelled to write this book, except perhaps to combat neo-orthodoxy which he thinks is predestinarianism all over again. But since he misconceives the spirit and the letter of neo-orthodoxy, this book is untimely and unrewarding. His charges of immorality against the Protestant Reformed Theology (pp. 61, 85) will gratify those who agree with him without adding to their understanding or justice. They will also alienate Protestants who are trying to recover whatever good there may be in their own tradition. If the intention of the book is to convert Protestants, it will fail. If it is to bring about a reconciliation between Catholics and Protestants, again it will fail, because what the author asks of the latter is to follow the Council of Trent (p. 77) and "Cardinal Juan de Lugo, the Spanish Jesuit, who wrote in Rome under the eyes of Pope Urban VIII, at the end of the seventeenth century (p. 63)." However, this book may be written for the edification of Catholics. But we cannot see how it can edify anybody.

The solution of the theological problem of grace given by the author, as from Baron Von Hügel, interpreting the above mentioned Cardinal, is this:

"Now what happens as a rule is simply this: the soul that in good faith seeks God, his truth and love, concentrates its attention, under the influence of grace, upon those elements of truth, be they many or few, which are offered to it in the sacred books and religious schools and assemblies of the Church, Sect, or Philosophy in which it has been brought up. It feeds upon these elements, the others are

simply passed by; and divine grace, under cover of these elements, feeds and saves his soul. I submit that this view admirably combines a sense of man's profound need of tradition, institution, training, with full justice to the importance of the dispositions and acts of the individual soul, and, above all, with a keen sense of the need of special graces offered by God to the several souls (pp. 63-64)."

This is a pious, clerical, reasonable statement. But does it settle the theological question of grace? God has given us "means of grace" which we must use. But what does "divine grace, under cover of these elements, feeds and saves the soul" mean? Grace is defined as "the personal influence of God." It is brought to bear upon men either by the direct action of the Holy Spirit working within them, or by means of mediating agencies (p. 102). How does such grace "feed"? If grace feeds *either* by the direct action of the Holy Spirit *or* through the means of grace, can one think of grace and the means of grace as two sides of the same process in which the soul is "fed" and saved? If a man can be saved without the means of grace, then there is a freedom of God which bespeaks Divine initiative. In some sense, God freely chooses to visit us with this grace. In some sense, the impartation of Divine grace is not conditioned upon our "dispositions and acts," and it is not conditioned upon the Church as a human institution. Hence, there is justice to the Reformation principle of *sola fide, sola gratia*. Theologically, it is an acknowledgment of God as the sole "primary cause" of salvation, which is stated tersely in Paul's "All things [are] of God (II Cor. 5:18a)." Ecclesiastically and politically, it is a call to the Church for humility and self-criticism which is not, and has not been, too evident in the "Catholic" Church. It is not enough to say, "Use the means of grace offered in the Church and trust to God to feed you and save you." This is neither theology nor exegesis nor sound advice. The Protestants, as this writer, can only answer, "No thank you. We have no infallible priesthood who shall give us security in God's sight. We accept the means of grace with gratitude, but our confidence is in God who alone can forgive sin and raise the dead."

JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN

McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.

Freedom and Order, Lessons from the War. By EDUARD HEIMANN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947. pp. xiv-344. \$3.00.

The title of this reflective work gives the basic theme which the author states more positively in the first chapter: if democracy is to be saved, it must establish a proper balance between freedom and order. Neither can exist without the other save as an abstraction. However, order is more physically necessary and freedom more spiritually necessary. The war was really fought, as Heimann interprets it, to save freedom from the tyrannical imposition of order which resulted from the failure of democracy in the German atmosphere.

In his introduction, Heimann assures the reader that this will be an elementary treatise and incidentally promises to avoid such abstruse expressions as "the dialectic" but to deal with the realities covered by that term in a simple way. His good intentions are admirable and last as far as page 17, where he forgets himself and brings it in, and again on page 96 refers to it three times by name. The instructed reader will not be disturbed by this, except to wonder whether a philosophically minded writer should bind himself by any such promise. It is certain that the author

has not produced a popular work, though it is clearly and expressively written; we may confidently predict that it will not have a wide audience, although it should have. The readers of the Great Books could profitably turn their energies into a treatise like this which presents a searching analysis of our contemporary world in basic terms. Probably they will not do so. But the pastor or religious leader who neglects it will miss a rich and rewarding experience.

Professor Heimann not only shows that Germany never had a liberal revolution but that the national ideology lacked moderation—the German developed a ruthless individualism and then required an equally ruthless tyranny to keep it in order. This Teutonic preference for looking into the abyss of chaos is a characteristic feature from Nietzsche to Spengler. The state became the lawless individual raised to the *n*th degree; and Lutheranism added its theology to reinforce the tendency by insisting that if the inward life were cultivated, externals would take care of themselves. Ethics, then, became purely personal rather than social or institutional. It was the business of the state to command; and when the republic failed to carry out this task, the German people no longer regarded it as a true state and accepted the authoritarianism of Hitler as a necessity of order.

On the other hand, the western world, adopting the program of liberalism, expected order to result from the economic process through the mechanism of the market. The reliance on "natural" order produced a distrust of state action to restore order even where it had started to disappear. This fear of the state appeared among pacifists as well as *laissez-faire* economists. Both "deny the necessity of protecting order from the abuse of liberty." The suspicion of the government appeared in its purest form in the United States, which had no previous feudal or medieval tradition to moderate its liberty; thus its liberty could quickly degenerate into the lawlessness of monopoly capitalism.

On the other hand, socialism (by which Heimann seems to mean the Marxian brand with its later continental modifications) saw that the excesses of liberty would result in a crisis and proceeded to plump for order without liberty. Like the *laissez-faire* theorists, Marxists became doctrinaire. The older socialism spoke of a right to work; when, however, it substituted the term "security" for this, it moved toward fascism. In holding to the doctrine that the industrial order was proletarianizing the worker, it overlooked the continual increase of an independent bourgeoisie and totally failed in its analysis of agriculture. In attacking ownership while managerial function was becoming the reality, socialism estranged itself from the support of all owners of stock. Hitler made no such blunder.

Instead of a uniform theory Heimann urges that socialism must today recognize plurality—one-man units in agriculture, units of different size in industry, and the many organizational forms of a highly specialized commerce. It must also insist on equal freedom between groups. If it attains this flexibility it will come to a balance between freedom and order, and refute Hayek's principle which at bottom is only like saying that the knife of the surgeon cannot stop short of cutting the patient's throat (p. 5). While Russia has suffered from Marxian rigidity, she now allows twenty-six per cent of her farming on individual homesteads—which is the entering wedge for freedom (p. 156).

Finally Heimann shows that order and freedom are both ethically neutral, with their value dependent on the way each is used. The two cannot be rationally reconciled; they can only be organized through the broader concepts of justice and love, both of which stem from religious sources. What is needed is the awareness of a Christian moral order, one deeper than the manifestations of Catholicism,

Protestantism, or the "Christian heresy" of Communism. Only basic Christianity with its polarity of justice and love will serve as the basis for a true reconciliation of freedom and order in our time. This recognizes the unlimited possibilities for both evil and good in man, as well as his ability to choose between them.

While this review cannot give details of his last chapter on "rethinking fundamentals," it at least suggests the major conclusion. What the reader may ask for is a more concrete way of suggesting how this can be applied in the social and political realities of our time. It is precisely at this point that Heimann stops.

R. A. SCHERMERHORN

Rhode Island State College, Kingston, Rhode Island.

The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel. By I. G. MATTHEWS. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. xii-304. \$4.00.

This book on the history of the Hebrew religion from its origin to A.D. 135 represents a notable achievement. Every student of the Ancient Near East knows how complex and numerous are the problems involved when he tries to extract from the mass of available documents a co-ordinate and readable picture of the religious development of Israel. To carry out such a task, one needs to be acquainted not only with the Old Testament itself and the many monographs dealing with its interpretation, but also with a vast amount of archaeological information.

Professor Matthews is a remarkably well-informed scholar, and he has succeeded in packing within a few hundred pages a large store of useful material. Unfortunately his book will satisfy only those readers who already share his philosophical presuppositions. He hastily brushes aside definitions of religion "built on theological assumptions inherited from the prescientific era" but he accepts uncritically those resting on the philosophical assumptions of John Dewey and Vergilius Ferm. He implies that Christian theologians believe in "an infallible revelation, complete and authoritative for all time, supernaturally communicated to man in the dim dawn of history" and he prefers "the more understandable conviction that among all nations, in all ages, knowledge of the good, the true, and the beautiful has been mediated through mental and moral discrimination, and that achievements in human welfare, and in religion, have ever rested on wise and adventuresome leadership that enlisted the energy of interested groups" (p. 3). It is then not surprising to find that the author emphasizes the diversity of Hebrew beliefs and rites at the expense of their unity and that he explains Hebrew religious reactions as "part of the social phenomena, . . . group responses to the influences that, in the course of history, were ever at play in the life of the people" (p. 4).

The religion of the seminomads is presented as if it had been practically the same as that of the modern bedouins (pp. 7-40). Moses is considered merely as "the man of the hour" (p. 48). Although the importance of the Mosaic covenant is described as "crucial" (p. 58) and the Hebrew consciousness of Yahweh as liberator is recognized (p. 67), the idea of election is ignored. Professor Matthews believes that J. Hempel, among others, "has so labored the covenant as an act of divine choice that mutual obligation and the process of development have been disregarded" (p. 58, n. 52). He suggests that the exclusive devotion of the Hebrews to Yahweh "may be an expression of the well-known Semitic genius for religion" (p. 68). Why, then, we may ask, were the Hebrews, in contrast with the Canaanites, "clean in morals" and "united in purpose" (p. 80)?

Chapters devoted to the great prophets are written with incisive perspicacity

as to the social, political, and economic forces which played a part in the formulation of ethical monotheism, but several passages suggest that the God worshiped by Israel did not exist independently of Israel's beliefs and that Israel's beliefs in turn were the result of human "reflection on the facts observed in history and society" (p. 129). Thus one reads that Yahweh Zebaoth, the early war-god, was "converted" by the eighth-century prophets. On the psychology of prophetic inspiration, the author's views are quite definite. He believes that Amos and his successors arrived at their revolutionary conclusions "through normal intellectual processes" (p. 131). When Micah declared that he was "full of power by the spirit of Yahweh," he meant that he was inspired by the idea of justice (p. 131).

This review is not a place for the discussion of prophetic inspiration. Only one question will be asked: why does the author ignore the prophets' consciousness of *compulsion* to speak? Professor Matthews' description of Jeremiah as "a godly man, doing his duty in the light of conscience" (p. 151) reveals a confusion between him and some minor public official of the nineteenth century A.D. On Jeremiah's confessions of spiritual agony, one reads the following comment, "his deepest response to the highest he knew gave him the sense of the conquering presence of the Invisible. With him the 'I' and Yahweh were integrated in his personality" (p. 157). Does the author consider that such a psychological phenomenon may be described as "normal intellectual process"?

While the treatment of Jeremiah extends throughout the length of twenty-two pages, one is startled to see that Ezekiel is dismissed in less than one page and a half as a disciple of Jeremiah. Even if one were to accept the results of extreme literary criticism according to which only a few verses should be considered as genuine, the fact remains that the book of Ezekiel as it now stands contains a theological thought whose influence upon Judaism has been considerable. Incidentally, the reader will miss a discussion of the abnormal aspects of Ezekiel's personality. Is it unfair to suggest that Professor Matthews' theory of prophetic inspiration might have somewhat suffered from such a discussion?

Second Isaiah and Job are presented in a chapter entitled "The Religion of the Intellectuals," although it is admitted that Job's cry was one "of faith in ultimate realities" (p. 172) and that the anonymous singer of Yahweh's servant "had attained a view of life that triumphed over tragedy" (p. 177). Intellectuals they may have been in the sense that they were endowed with superior intellects and rejoiced in trying to elucidate their faith in words of unsurpassed beauty. But they were intellectuals who had been saved from intellectual pride, for they had been shown a dimension of knowledge that transcends human reason.

Because the author appears to shun the theological categories of divine grace and human sinfulness, he tends to become unduly severe for the religion of the priests (pp. 182 ff.). He underestimates the fact that the priestly codes were not more than manuals of ceremony and ritual and that the Psalter, that hymnal of the second Temple, was the true mirror of Hebrew worship.

Finally, one detects perhaps wrongly a supercilious, or at least a slightly unsympathetic attitude in the treatment of messianism and apocalypticism (The Religion of Supernaturalism, pp. 217 ff.).

The word "pilgrimage" used in the title of this book suggests that the religion of the Hebrews led to a clear and certain end. For Professor Matthews, the pilgrimage of Israel found its completion in rabbinical Judaism, not even incidentally in the "sect of the Nazarenes" (p. 255). While the historian's intention to be

impartial deserves high praise, one regrets that he did not draw the lines of definite continuity which exist between the religion of the Hebrews and the historical phenomenon known as Christianity.

SAMUEL L. TERRIEN

Union Theological Seminary. New York City.

The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow. Edited by HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947. pp. xviii-435. \$6.00.

This volume is described by its editor as "a true and typical expression of the co-operative life and thought of the members" of the Chicago Society for Biblical Research, which came into being a little over fifty years ago, first as a section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, and soon thereafter as an autonomous body. During its existence this Society has been creatively active in important developments in American biblical research. The present volume, deriving its title from E. C. Colwell's *The Study of the Bible*, represents "a development and enlargement of the program of the Society for the academic year 1945-46."

The title accurately suggests the contents of the book. It contains twenty-four essays designed to survey the main trends in biblical study since World War I, and to point the way to and arouse interest in advance in the immediate future. The authors, with the exception of six (J. H. Cobb, H. M. Orlinsky, W. F. Albright, C. C. McCown, F. C. Grant, S. E. Johnson), are centered in and around Chicago, and they all look more to the future than to the past. They hope to raise more questions than they answer and to have their work valued primarily in terms of stimulation to fresh research.

The twenty-four essays are divided equally into two parts. Part I consists of surveys of the current achievements and trends in Protestant scholarship, with an essay each devoted to current Jewish and Catholic scholarship. Part II contains special studies of salient problems, including such directly historical issues as the influence of Palestinian geography upon religious experience, the relationship between Jesus' ideas and first-century Jewish ethics, and problems relative to the origin of the Christian Church; a treatment of the role of the Bible in the Reformation, and a critique of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament; and, perhaps of predominant current interest, essays on the theology of the Bible, an interest in which is also reflected at many other points throughout the book.

A thorough evaluation of the separate essays in such a volume as this is precluded by its scope. To do full justice to the authors one would have to be a master of more fields of study than is the case with this reviewer. Certain impressions may be stated, however, with the realization that they undoubtedly reflect as much of the reviewer's interests and leanings as of the quality of the book itself.

I am impressed with the testimony which this book gives to the creative scholarship of the Chicago Society. When it is viewed, not only by itself, but as a continuation of the work of such scholars as Burton, Breasted, Case, Goodspeed, and others, it is impressive. If the book could do no more than to encourage similar enterprises in other sections of the country, it would accomplish an important mission.

Judging the book in the light of its purpose, I find it very helpful personally

and believe that it will be a source of stimulation to many. Its full appreciation and major usefulness will probably be confined largely to professional students of the Bible, although it could be read with great profit by ministers and interested laymen. Some of the essays have value almost solely as "bibliographical commentaries"; an expanded list of books, listed in one place with separate headings, would probably increase facility in its use in this respect. Other essays make their impact in the form of ideas and conjectures which challenge thought. Although there is some overlapping, inevitable in a work of this kind, the total effect is of a comprehensive coverage of fields of study. Despite variation in the relative value of the essays—again, to be expected—the general quality is high. Differences in point of view and in methodology increase the value of the work, although it would be more truly representative of Bible study in America, if conservative voices were allowed to speak more fully for themselves.

If I were to single out one of several "tendencies" in the essays which seems to me of importance, I would mention the effort to define discriminatingly the meaning of historical research, so as to retain a valid scientific method along with greater recognition of the influence which the investigator's philosophy of history has upon his conclusions. This ties in with the keen interest displayed in biblical theology. Amos Wilder's discerning treatment of three different levels at which the theology of the New Testament can be presented is a fitting climax to this aspect of the book. How much unnecessary confusion would be avoided, if those who seek to interpret the theology of the Bible—and other aspects of its meaning as well—would carefully define and state their presuppositions!

Discerning readers of this book will undoubtedly question many of the opinions expressed therein. That is apparently exactly what the authors expect and desire, that through the give and take of intelligent discussion we may approach absolute truth. I for one am grateful to them for their stimulating invitation to such discussion.

D. T. ROWLINGSON

Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia.

Gospel Records of the Message and Mission of Jesus Christ. A Harmony of the Gospels in the Text of the Revised Standard Version. By ALBERT CASSEL WIEAND. Elgin, Illinois: Brethren Publishing House, 1947. pp. 266. \$3.00.

The author claims for this new Harmony of the Gospels that it is more than a "harmony." In his words it "is a more analytic and detailed parallel arrangement than is usually attempted. Its major purpose is to appeal to the creative historical imagination, as Horace Bushnell somewhere says. It aims to 'remove the remoteness' of the Biblical events; to bring out with greater force the inherent dramatic power of each incident, and of the life of Christ as a whole; and to make them seem more real to us."

A somewhat elaborate scheme is used in the effort to execute the announced purpose. The usual method of arranging the text under appropriate headings is employed. But in addition there are these "features": sectional detailed outlines of all principal divisions; sketch maps to correspond with these outlines at appropriate points; each story is "scenically analyzed" and divided into paragraphs; paragraph titles are given in the margin, "so formulated in associated sequence as to form a graphic story-outline" of each incident; "paragraphs are analyzed into

their essential ideas; each is printed in a line by itself; and each directly parallels the same idea in the other Gospels."

There is doubt as to whether this somewhat complicated organization of the text achieves the author's aim to make the Scripture live. The "vari-type" in which the book is printed is not easy to read. If ordinary standard type could have been used the results would have been more satisfying.

Harmonies of the Gospels are useful, and this harmony will serve the laudable purpose of illustrating the life of Christ in keeping with the traditional arrangement of the material with the new Revised Standard Version as the text. This harmony follows the chronological scheme of the life of Christ used in A. T. Robertson's *A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ*. It utilizes the material from John's Gospel in the manner that Robertson's Harmony uses it, but it departs from the method of placing the Markan material in the first parallel column. It does not show in the manner of Burton and Goodspeed's *Harmony* "parallel material in nonparallel sections."

The author is president emeritus of Bethany Biblical Seminary.

EDWARD A. McDOWELL

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky.

Laymen Speaking. Selected and edited by WALLACE C. SPEERS. New York: Association Press, 1947. pp. 207. \$2.00.

For its commission as well as omission, preachers ought to read a book like this, even though it is meant for laymen. Aside from an excellent introduction by Dr. Fosdick, there are twenty-seven articles by laymen, and one by a Methodist preacher, from down Texas way, mistaken for a layman since he leads the work of a laymen's group. Fifteen of the twenty-seven are associated with business or finance; three are lawyers; one is a United States Senator, one a surgeon. Three are teachers, two are in public relations; one manages a book department, and one represents labor. A list like this gives good backing to the charge that the Protestant Church is dominantly capitalistic. One doubts if denominations figured in the selection of these testimonies; but the book looks close to an adjunct of the Presbyterian Church.

That there is a mighty movement of the Spirit in the men who penned these lines; that there is an astonishing amount of liberal and scholarly thinking, a wholesouled devotion to the church that might well shame many a preacher, is evident on almost every page. You will have to search long and go far to beat A. Ludlow Kramer's "A Businessman's Search for God," or to find a more spiritually stimulating message than John D. Rockefeller's "God Is Man's Crying Need," a message which shows that humility is also one of his virtues. Only one or two of the articles suggest that, in writing them, the brother was indulging in total mental relaxation!

Divided into five sections: "The Personal and Social Need for Religion," "The Layman in His Personal Life," "The Layman in His Church," "The Layman in His Business Life," and "The Layman At Work in the World," the editorial work done on this book shows an intelligent grasp on how to sustain interest and on the build-up of a message; it might, with vast profit, be studied by preachers. Perhaps the most shocking aspect of this book is the regularity with which the laymen writing in it pride themselves on the most primitive type of stewardship, and seem nowhere to be cognizant of the relationship between their

spiritual problems and their unquestioned assumptions of the validity of acquisition. Did not Aquinas say that men had confessed all manner of sin to him, save one, covetousness?

JOHN M. VERSTEEG

Superintendent, Lima District, Ohio Annual Conference, The Methodist Church; Lima, Ohio.

Best Sermons, 1947-48 Edition. Edited by G. PAUL BUTLER. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. pp. xxii-317. \$2.75.

The 1947-48 edition of *Best Sermons* is not just a book of fifty-two good sermons—it is that, for Dr. Butler has certainly rendered a real service in the wise and careful selection from the many sermons submitted. The outstanding contribution of this selection, however, is its catholicity; for here are fine sermons from our outstanding Protestant ministers, here also is the great philosophy of the leading Catholic clergy, and within its pages is to be found profound wisdom and insight from those of the Hebrew tradition. These are sermons from professors of theology, from deans of great cathedrals, and from ministers of great city churches not only here in America, but in the various countries of Europe as well.

The sermons that have been selected sound as though their authors were desperately trying to get their people to see that there are available resources of spiritual power which can undergird life, and that even though our day is one of confusion and complexity it does not have to be a time of despair and despondency. It is, as Dr. Fosdick has so rightly said, "a great time to be alive"; and these sermons are saying that.

It is truly a fine thing to find in one book the best sermons that have been preached both here and abroad, and through these sermons come to know and appreciate the great preachers who are dealing with the eternal verities of God.

JOHN W. RUSTIN

Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, Washington, D. C.

Ed. Note: In connection with the above review, Harper & Brothers makes the following announcement. Another world-wide search is under way for material for the fourth volume of *Best Sermons* edited by G. Paul Butler and published by Harper & Brothers. For the first three volumes of this series, clergymen of the Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic faiths sent in over 18,000 sermons from every important area of the world. The 52 sermons in the 1947-48 Edition were selected from among 6,447 sermons. For the forthcoming volume, sermons preached from January 1, 1947, to July 1, 1948, will be included, and must be submitted before July 4, 1948. No sermon criticizing another sect or faith will be considered. Sermons should be submitted to G. Paul Butler, 431 Riverside Drive, New York 25, New York.

The Heart of the Yale Lectures. By BATSELL BARRETT BAXTER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. pp. 332. \$2.50.

This book will be a boon to the busy pastor of today. While he has taken the work of others, he has so arranged it and presented it that it will become useful, whereas most pastors would never have the time to dig into the many volumes of these magnificent lectures over the period of years which they cover.

The general theme of the Yale Lectures, of course, is the preacher, preaching,

and all associated subjects. Under the headings in the book, "The Preacher," "The Sermons," "The Congregation," Baxter has gleaned from the lectures of the great men who delivered them the most helpful gems of suggestion and instruction. He has done a remarkable job and it is to be commended to everyone who is desirous of improving as he goes along his own style, presentation, and delivery.

The topics under discussion never grow old, because the minister is seeking to improve himself and his message all along. It is necessary also to know how to adapt the message to the day in which we live. Much help is given here. Going back as far as 1877, and underlying all the lectures that follow, the fundamental basic truths are evident. Toward the end of the period there comes a great deal of helpful suggestion as to the presentation of the gospel in this modern time.

Baxter has done for the preacher what the *Reader's Digest* has done for busy people everywhere—gleaning from important material the nuggets of gold and presenting them in such a way that the purpose of the message is not lost, while time is greatly saved by the removal of much of the padding.

Dr. Baxter has rendered a service that we will all appreciate, because he has stayed true to the high purpose of the lectures and has done no violence, it seems to me, to the men who delivered them. His bibliography, appendix, and index all make an easy approach to further study of any of the subjects he discusses.

The work has been well done. It will have a wide reception on the desk of every growing preacher. It is my pleasure to commend it to those who seek to improve themselves in the service of Christ and the church.

C. OSCAR JOHNSON

Pastor, Third Baptist Church, St. Louis, Missouri.

The College Seeks Religion. By MERRIMON CUNINGGIM. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947. pp. 319. \$4.00.

Does it? One instinctively asks this question when he sees Merrimon Cuninggim's arresting title, *The College Seeks Religion*. The author's clear statement of "the thesis," together with his background and evident fitness, at once constrains one to withhold judgment to see if he makes his case. He does!

One who has lived through the years covered and has made a continuous effort to get colleges "to seek religion" may find it difficult to be sufficiently objective as a reviewer. This whole study is concerned with a large and too generally neglected field. Many have known the patient was ill, but few have attempted, and perhaps none more successfully than the author, a careful diagnosis of the case. He never forgets that the college exists for the best interest of its students, and he prescribes accordingly.

Starting with the founders who had "both the practice and conviction" of the place of religion in American colleges, Chapter II, "Colleges in the Twentieth Century," moves rapidly through causes, trends, and practices that led to secularism, the real danger in and following World War I, and the encouraging swing toward religion during and after World War II.

Following Chapters II and III on "Colleges in the Twentieth Century" and "Religion in the Twentieth Century," attitudes in church-related, independent, and tax-supported institutions are set forth with an array of important data and quotations constituting a valuable anthology of historic material in the educational world. So well has the author done this, together with his intelligent diagnosis

of the situation, that he has placed every reader under heavy debt for his illumination of this area. Everyone interested in this general field has had at least a vague idea of values which this treatment clarifies in a most convincing fashion. The author proceeds logically from causes to effects. His reasoning and conclusions will have lasting value for educators.

Readers will be stimulated by the masterful handling of three major groups of educators: "progressive," "classical," and "liberal." Expressions of their philosophy of education are sometimes in agreement, but not generally. Here again the author supplies a rich collection of quotations covering a wide range of authorities in all three groups. His conclusion is that the present trend is hopefully toward the "liberal" philosophy which he points out may well include the real values of the other two approaches. He rates "progressive" and "classical" as attempts to find another way of stating the "liberal" view. While all three groups *allow* religion, the "liberal" philosophy *demand*s consideration of religion in all its aspects.

We should not, but we must, pass over the clear treatment that the separation of church and state, among other important trends and developments, receives. It is impossible to consider many significant movements and even helpful details in this brief review. This omission may be somewhat offset by beginning with Chapter IX and following through to the end of the volume listing chapter titles, subtitles of sections and paragraphs, which constitute an interesting and rather comprehensive review of this large section of the treatise. We must leave with only a wave of our hand this masterful study of programs, methods, and general efforts toward establishing religion in its proper place.

The author pays his respects to secularism, which, in a sense, is the total atmosphere in which higher education lives, pointing clearly to its dangers. He does not, however, turn pessimist; he says "the struggle continues" but "there are many signs of hope," and "many of the manifestations of secularism are beginning to lose their hold upon higher education."

In no place does the author allow theory to run away with facts or the wish to become father of *his* thought. He carefully threads his course through the live wires of facts that finally lead him to the logical conclusion. One is convinced that his honesty would have taken him another way if the evidence had not driven him to the hopeful conclusion he reaches. He frankly admits that no college ever has or ever will attain an "adequate" goal, but says none can afford to aim at less. The treatment is so exhaustive and thoroughly honest that this volume will be of permanent value to all educators.

Dr. Cuninggim tacitly indicates that in this, as in the personal realm, he who seeks will find. "What circuit first—?"

H. M. McPHERSON

Board of Education of The Methodist Church, Nashville, Tennessee.

Modern Japan and Shinto Nationalism. By DANIEL C. HOLTOM. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947. pp. ix-226. \$2.75.

Darkness of the Sun. By RICHARD T. BAKER. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947. pp. 254. \$2.50.

The reason for bringing two such books as these together in one review is that one major emphasis running through both is on the relationship between Shinto and wartime Japan. *Modern Japan and Shinto Nationalism* is largely a reprint

of Dr. Holtom's scholarly treatise of 1943 on modern Shinto, but two chapters have been added to describe the postwar developments in Shinto and to indicate future possible trends as Shinto takes its place beside the other religions as a religion rather than as a patriotic and nationalistic cult. Dr. Holtom is a retired missionary, and for many years has been an outstanding scholar and authority in the field of Japanese religions, especially Shinto. He returned to the United States shortly before the war.

Darkness of the Sun is a very readable and interesting account of personal observations made by a youthful news correspondent in Japan, Korea, China, and the Philippines during the winter of 1945-46, emphasizing what took place in the Christian church during the war. It shows what happened both to people and property. It also reveals quite objectively how fanatical agents of a highly nationalistic and totalitarian state, backed by the authority of "divine" sanction and sense of mission, sought to impose their will on all religions. There is no attempt to cover up the shortcomings and weaknesses of the small struggling group of Christians in an overwhelmingly hostile environment; yet Mr. Baker points out the courageous way in which many Christians refused to bow down or to compromise themselves completely.

The books supplement each other as they describe the use made of Shinto and all its trappings during the war. From different approaches the authors bring out the importance of understanding the distinction between State Shinto and Sect or Sectarian Shinto, and the causes of the comparatively recent development of State Shinto. Dr. Holtom is less inclined to emphasize this, for as he says, "there is no law or ordinance that says in so many words that State Shinto is not a religion and that Sectarian Shinto is." He does admit, however, that in actual practice government officials have frequently so interpreted the situation. Our authors agree on the significance of the successful directive which eliminated the unhealthy aspects of a militarily sponsored State Shinto, while at the same time allowing to continue the age-old nature worship of Sect Shinto which represents to the Japanese people a part of their cultural heritage and tradition.

Christianity in wartime Japan had but two choices: persecution and martyrdom or compromise and accommodation. Holtom describes how government officials, utilizing Shinto and all its implications, brought pressures which resulted in an extreme degree of "accommodation" by the church. Baker describes what he saw and heard about the extent to which the church and individual Christians did or did not succumb to the direct and indirect attacks from officials, public opinion, and social pressures. As might be expected, some of the greatest pressures occurred in educational institutions, and Baker gives a graphic account of what happened to the Christian schools. He also carefully analyzes the developments within the United Church of Christ in Japan.

From two different angles we are given a glimpse of the attempts to extend State Shinto overseas and among non-Japanese peoples. Holtom stresses the more political aspect of Japan's basic philosophy which said that "Shinto must go overseas as the unique institution of Japanese political expansion." Baker approaches the problem more from the church-state battle in Korea, China, and the Philippines, as the agents of Japan's expansion sought to gain totalitarian control over even the religious life and thinking of conquered peoples.

The fundamental conflict in Japan through the years has been that of nationalism versus universalism. Extreme nationalism has had its day, and the question

both authors point out is the degree to which the other historical trend can be expected to find its place following the removal of the more or less artificial controls of a foreign military occupation.

There is no attempt to discount the obstacles and difficulties to be overcome, but both books give an over-all impression of potential hope for the future. Dr. Holtom, in spite of a few minor inaccuracies on recent developments, gives an accurate picture of their implications for good. He also emphasizes the permanent values of Sect Shinto as "an ethics, a ritual, and a system of thought." And he closes with the following thoughtful paragraph:

"Shinto in the past gave its blessing to whatever was regarded as having utmost importance in the general social and national experience. It will continue to do so in the future. Everything depends on the nature of what is believed to have utmost importance. This is a factor that is subject to change. The Western world is much concerned with the purpose that the Japanese conviction of what is significant shall include in its dominant pattern a respect for individual personality and a social and political nexus woven from free co-operation of morally responsible men and women. This is the meaning of real democracy. The measure of Japan's participation in it depends directly on the extent to which she is given a vital stake in genuine democracy on a world level."

Mr. Baker emphasizes the importance of the Christian remnant which remained faithful. Based on this element of hope, there seems to be cause for anticipating the realization of the Japanese proverb quoted in the last chapter, "After the rain the ground becomes solid." In other aspects and in other countries in the Orient, the author wonders whether it is not more likely that for a time, at least, boggy and marshy land will follow the rains. "The Japanese people," says Mr. Baker, "are today realizing how stupid they were. It is a profoundly humbling experience for them. Everywhere they are confessing their error. But it is more than repentance toward us, the conquerors. It is a pride-shattering repentance before themselves. And right here is the secret of the mood of emptiness and disillusionment and genuine despair which grips the Japanese people today . . . these items of faith are being swept away, leaving a vacuum where they were."

He emphasizes that spiritual rebirth cannot be built upon "moods of weariness, disillusionment, and despair among the people, nor where cynical political interests negate the aims of simple justice, nor where tentativeness and waiting rob the people of goals and singleness of purpose." To help fill the vacuum aright, the church and the missionary must be alive to the demands of the new day, must be sympathetic to and helpful in the economic and social as well as the spiritual needs of the people.

The closing pages point out some of the dangers facing the church and the missionary enterprise in Japan, especially the importance of remaining clear of dependence on American armed protection. "Only the sincerest show of good will," says Mr. Baker, "toward the Japanese people's welfare and the most meticulous objectivity toward the intrigue of nations will make the missionaries' position tenable, and free the Christian evangel to move among the people without the marks of coercion and political power upon it." In such a spirit, Mr. Baker's closing words are significant, "This is an urgent hour in which Christians live today. And an hour of opportunity."

RUSSELL L. DURGIN

International Committee of the Y.M.C.A. in Japan, Tokyo, Japan.

The Willow and the Bridge. Poems and Meditations by TOYOHICO KAGAWA and FRANKLIN COLE. Association Press, 1947. pp. 84. \$1.50.

During the late war all sorts of predictions were made as to the fate of the Christian movement in Japan and its native and foreign leadership. Kagawa, being a shining mark, was the most inviting target. American newspapers encouraged distrust of him, and authorities in Japan imprisoned him several times and managed pretty well to keep the rest of the world speculating about what had happened to him.

This little compilation is a revelation of some of the things that were going on in his mind during the war years. In so far as one's innermost soul can be committed to the confidences of poetic reflection and spiritual meditation, we have just that here. Not all that he thought and felt, to be sure; but the Kagawa who made himself known and loved in *Songs of the Slums*, ten years ago, seems to be the same man despite the war years that have blown over his bowed head. His collaborator in this volume has fitted his own mood to that of his distinguished colleague and the result, despite the dual authorship of writers with widely divergent backgrounds, is a happy one. They unitedly hope in their preface that this co-operative literary labor will help to construct "one small section of the bridge that will someday unite our people again in an understanding and brotherly spirit."

It is in the light of this intention that the testament and quality of these pieces are to be understood and accepted. There is no effort, they say, "to pit literary style against style." Nor, we judge, do they propose to pit their literary style and achievement against the miscellaneous multitude of those who write poems and meditations. It would be unfair therefore to compare Kagawa with his Japanese literary contemporaries, or Cole with his. The worth of their prospecting is to be assayed on the scales which they have provided for weighing it.

Kagawa is best, as we would expect, when he sticks to his native métier. Japanese poetry is distinctive and delightful and it is likely to be neither if it is hybridized. Hence the orientalisms with which his verses abound are charming.

"We shall bear the lid
Of the coffin on our backs
And pray.

I shed my blood here, everywhere,
Like drops of universal light

I keep a silence with heaven
And breathe with face upward
Like a tree top

I shall walk in the sky
With the sun

The ocean gave birth to the Okinawas"

These are metaphors as quaint as they are poignant and impart a flavor that savors all his moods of weeping, contrition, or exaltation.

Not so happy is his effort at rhyme in the English fashion.

"Your witness I accept.

But I'm no coward: pray heed e'er more you've wept"

adds nothing to his title poem "The Willow." The poem described in the notes as the "Labor Song of the Fuji Electric Furnace Company" is truly striking if it be taken for what it is. As verse, its rhymes halt and its feet stumble. Here is the versifier's ancient difficulty with verbs and nouns that fail to make the grade as rhymes because of tenses and cases. Japanese, accommodatingly, has very little case and tense trouble.

Mr. Cole, oddly enough, succeeds remarkably well when he adopts the linguistic pattern of his friend. The poem that gives the book its title (page 15) is definitely and delightfully Japanese. So also is "The Dispossessed" on page 41. Here the quality is enhanced by liberties he takes with two nouns "hyssop" and "acid," which he converts into verbs. Many verbs have made this metamorphosis—note the still somewhat vulgar "contact." Mr. Cole's use of this device in his work—he does it also in "Since Hiroshima" where "gaunt fingers . . . balm away the pain"—may have dubious grammatical support but it definitely imparts the flavor of an orientalism. However in his strongest poems, in this reviewer's judgment, he abjures the oriental métier, however quaint it is and however successful he is with it, and sticks to *vers libre*. "The Dispossessed" is not too Kagawesque; "Who Shall Remember" is a striking reflection on the effects of the signing of the surrender documents in Tokyo Bay, and "No Poppies Here" gives a delightful lyric turn to the Flander's Field motif of the earlier war.

It is unfortunate that his sonnet to Kagawa, "written aboard an American warship in Tokyo Bay" was not done with greater care. A sonnet is as exacting as *vers libre* is casual. Metrical feet must be regimented, and whatever the rhyme scheme, rhymes must rhyme. This is what makes sonnet-writing hard and the sonnet form relatively archaic in our times. But then, who should cavil? Tokyo Bay, when this sonnet was being born, was no doubt a poor place for sonnetting.

The total effect of this joint effort is gratifying. If the notes which occur on page 83 had been put at the beginning, they would have served their purpose better. The meditations of Kagawa, which Mr. Cole annotates but does not duplicate with his own, are typical homilies at which Kagawa is particularly adept. They also are distinctly oriental in their flavor. The Analects of Confucius have the same taste though the dialogue generally is briefer. Those who want really to know what Japan's most distinguished citizen and one of the world's most extraordinary Christians was thinking and feeling while he was living in the anguish of ten years of war will do well to read this book, carefully and repeatedly. He and his spiritual kinsman have put together many a bit of wisdom and tenderness to help in the building of the bridge that must some day provide two-way traffic lanes for all mankind to use.

EDWIN MCNEILL POTEAT

President, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York.

Art In the Early Church. By WALTER LOWRIE. New York: Pantheon Books, 1947. pp. xviii-268. 500 illustrations. \$6.50.

This is a perfectly delightful and a very valuable book. The author has devoted a lifetime to the study of early Christian art, not from the standpoint of the archaeologist-technician but of one primarily interested in religious values. His two years as Fellow in Christian Archaeology in the (now) American Academy at Rome, and his twenty-three-year pastorate of the (Episcopal) American Church

in Rome, gave him ample opportunity to study originals and live and work on friendly terms with such great archaeologists as Joseph Wilpert, Ernesto Buonaiuti, Victor Schulze, and Giovanni di Rossi.

The style of the book is free and personal—one might say engagingly garrulous, for the author uses the pronoun "I" constantly. This quality, unusual in a scholar, enables him to show where, how, and why he differs from the technicians in early Christian art, many of whom have no interest in the religion depicted.

After a forty-three-page Foreword, Prefatory Chapter, and Introduction, all informative of the author's viewpoints, the real work begins: Catacombs with their inscriptions, frescoes, sarcophagi; the House of the Church, in which are studied the plan and fabric of early basilicas through Justinian; Monumental Art, a study of mosaic decoration in apse, baptistery, and nave, together with altar, furniture, and utensils; Illustrated Bible Manuscripts; Industrial Arts; Civil and Ecclesiastical Dress. In all this detailed study the point of view is maintained that Christian art originated not in Greece, Alexandria, or Syria, but in Rome; and since Rome was peopled by all races, a thoroughly cosmopolitan city where till the middle of the third century Greek was the official language, Roman types of Christian art were carried all over the ancient world. This art differed from the Greek; it had a "new intention," a new view of this world and the next. As a consequence Greek naturalism with its emphasis on physical beauty and its later development of naturalistic backgrounds was rejected in favor of what ministered to the mind and soul. Portraiture gave place to "soul pictures," direct representation to symbols, and aesthetic pleasure to a spiritual experience conformable with the worship of God. Thus practically all figures depicted in early Christian art have a frontal aspect because they are "expected to speak to the beholder, to confront him as soul to soul."

In sepulchral art, mostly fresco and sculpture, everything was directed to the hope of resurrection and the life everlasting. Even where Old Testament themes were used, those were chosen which substantiated this hope. In church decoration, mostly mosaic, the walls of the nave instructed people in sacred history—a record of what God had done for his people—while the apsidal end was used for apocalyptic themes that fixed attention on things above and enabled men to participate with angels in worship. The past, present, and future were thus all fused into one grand divine event. About A.D. 600 Pope Gregory expressed the principle involved: "Pictures are used in the church in order that those who are ignorant of letters may by merely looking at the walls read there what they are unable to read in books."

Lowrie claims that the basilica form of church building originated with the church itself; that it was invented to fit the liturgy. The walls, always unadorned without, were a screen to keep out the world; they had no windows low enough to allow sight. Within was a protected space, a magic, mystical space that produced a sense of fascination because of the presence and operation of God, as in the Sacraments; the walls reminding the worshiper that God was present in history while the semidome of the apse symbolized heaven because of the figures shown. It would seem to the reviewer more reasonable to suppose, however, that because of its suitability for worship the church adopted and modified a structure already existing in the Roman Forum since 46 B.C.—the Basilica Julia.

These general principles and theories are illustrated by detailed descriptions of specific church buildings, decorations, and fittings, and further illuminated by the pictorial art in scripture rolls and codices, in the industrial arts and in costumes. Then follow a bibliography with 194 entries, only 32 of which are in English,

a full index and a chronological table. The 500 small halftone illustrations on coated paper are for the most part clear and beautiful. They are, of course, indispensable for an appreciation of the text.

This book should be used in the religious education of our children beginning with, say, high school, the age when boys and girls usually join the church. To facilitate this, lantern slides, 2 x 2 kodascopes or film strips should be made from photos of the most typical original objects (not the halftones in the book), and a series of talks on early church history, beliefs and liturgies should be given by the pastor or other qualified person. In the discussions that follow, the young people should be led to examine these beliefs in the light of the scientific and other viewpoints learned in school, and so to accept Christianity not blindly and traditionally but intelligently and devotedly. Our adults also need this education desperately. What an opportunity is here!

ALBERT EDWARD BAILEY

21 Saxon Road, Worcester, Massachusetts.

The Secrets of the Heart. Selected works by KAHILIL GIBRAN, translated from the Arabic. New York: Philosophical Library, 1947. pp. 339. \$4.75.

These are days of inflation. The flap of this beautifully printed book reminds the reader that Kahlil Gibran (1883-1931) is called by all Europe and South America the *Dante of the 20th Century* and is known to the world as the *Immortal Prophet of Lebanon* and the *Savant of His Age*. But to Eastern tongues he is merely *The Beloved Master*. This would tend to show that a highly colored and fiery imagination has been surrendered by the East to the West in this upside-down world of ours. The Editor's Preface speaks similarly of the "millions of followers in dozens of languages" who absorb Gibran's writings "practically as religious devotions," his excommunication from his church and exile from his country serving to fortify and augment his literary pariah.

The cause of publisher and followers could have been better served by claims more proportionate to the man and his work. There is no doubt as to the versatility of the artist who was commissioned to paint Rodin's portrait and who exhibited periodically in the capitals of the world; of the strange mastery of the poet in conveying the most subtle shades of life and color; of the gentleness of the mystic, of his deep sense of charity and brotherhood: "Remember, my brother, that the coin which you drop into the withered hand stretching toward you is the only golden chain that binds your rich heart to the loving heart of God."

The Prayer to the Christ which concludes *The Crucified*, written on Good Friday, is worthy of its great subject and of sheer religious beauty:

"The spatters of blood upon thy feet are more resplendent than the necklace of Ishtar.

"Forgive the weak who lament thee today, for they do not know how to lament themselves. . . ."

It is a prophetic voice which is raised in protest against the way in which the Savior's life and sacrifice is being misunderstood, exploited, and betrayed by a materializing and selfish clericalism:

"Jesus came not from the heart of the circle of Light to destroy the homes and build upon their ruins, the convents and monasteries. He did not persuade the strong man to become a monk or a priest. . . ."

Yet vindictiveness is of all themes the most delicate to handle. Vindictive passion must not even begin to suggest *personal* resentment. Jesus is our model at this point also. His scathing attacks on the religious leaders of his day could never be construed as arising from a resentment aiming at such or such individuals. Keeping this admittedly unattainable standard in mind, suppose we now turn to Gibran's essay on "Satan," in which a certain Father Samaan makes a pact with the badly wounded devil because without the devil he, the clergyman, would be out of business. Should not a clergyman realize that "Satan's existence alone has created his enemy, the Church? That ancient conflict is the secret which removes the gold and silver from the faithful's pocket and deposits it forever into the pouch of the preacher and missionary" (p. 43). There follows upon this assertion a perfectly inane cosmological version of the dawn of civilization, which might have been written by an obscure cousin of Baron d'Holbach way back in the days when eighteenth-century anticlericalism was seriously raising the question as to who came first, the egg or the hen, the answer being that priests invented religion in order to make money and gain political power. The climax of this unsavory lucubration shows Father Samaan carrying the dying devil back to the village, his lips moving in fervent prayer for Satan's life. Although not going to the same extreme, the essay on "John the Madman" provides another scathing caricature of the Lebanon clergy.

It may seem strange to find a Protestant reviewer making a stand for the Eastern clergy. To be sure, the vested interests of clericalism have led to disreputable excesses in Lebanon as elsewhere. Yet anyone who weighs the achievements of the church in the Near East since the days of the Crusades must rise in protest against such caricatures.

Kahlil Gibran is probably at his best in such essays as "The Tempest," which display with an uncanny suggestion of human climates the keenest sense of psychology: "I had long hoped for the opportunity to meet this strange man. I had endeavored in devious ways to win his friendship in order to study his reality and learn his story by inquiring as to his purpose in life, but my efforts were in vain."

There is always wisdom in cultivating one's own gifts, especially when one has been so richly endowed as was Kahlil Gibran.

EMILE CAILLIET

Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

These Shared His Passion, Cross, and Power. By EDWIN MCNEILL POTEAT.
New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948. pp. 504. \$1.95.

Here in one volume are brought together three books previously published, all from the pen of the President of the Colgate-Rochester Seminary. Dr. Poteat is one of the incisive preachers of this generation, and while none of the chapters are in sermonic form, much of the material in these thought-provoking pages must have made its first appearance in the pulpit rather than between the covers of a book. Each of the three books here collected into one follows the same general pattern. An individual (in a few cases it is a group) who participated in some event connected with the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus is portrayed, analyzed, and then represented as a symbol of some human quality which is thoroughly discussed. If in some of the discussions the people involved seem to become abstractions, that is perhaps inevitable in view of the method followed.

No one can read the book, however, without feeling better acquainted with New Testament characters as real people, because each chapter begins with a clearly etched short story featuring the character or characters about to be discussed. As a matter of fact, Dr. Poteat has given us two volumes rather than one—a collection of superb stories or vignettes, and a collection of essays dealing with problems raised in the tales. Sometimes the stories follow the pattern of the New Testament narratives. Sometimes they are almost wholly imaginative. They are written with a wealth of detail, with insight and understanding. Bible names come alive as people of flesh and blood, with fears, hopes, temptations, defeats, and victories. Even without the essays which interpret them, these narrative sections would constitute a fine contribution to the growing body of literature which retells the gospel story in fresh terms.

The essays are in the main psychological studies of character. And yet they are more than that. Dr. Poteat says he wrote with the conviction that the basic experiences of New Testament people were not very different from those through which all men pass in critical times. He records "the still unshaken judgment of nineteen centuries that passion, and death, and resurgence to new life are possible for individual and group only as they are accepted and assimilated in terms of the giant, universal, cosmic principles by which Jesus suffered, died, and rose again." These books were written as this country moved into and through the most terrible conflict in human history. The reader hears the echoes of some of the controversies which produced tensions within the Christian community during those days of strain. More clearly still he hears the authentic tones of the Christian gospel of redemption through the Cross of Christ.

A book with a thrust to it always raises questions, and it is one of the merits of Dr. Poteat's discussions that they provoke disagreements as well as assent. What authority is there for claiming that "Now is my soul troubled" expressed Jesus' remorse over having used a whip in the temple? Can Judas' act of betrayal be attributed to the hysteria of fear? Is the meaning of the Cross adequately expressed in the assertion that "voluntary self-limitation is the principle of self-realization?" Is it not an oversimplification to picture the problem of the modern world as a struggle between love and hate, without taking account of the degree to which love becomes thwarted or diluted by ignorance, lethargy, frustration, and indecision?

It is a wide range of problems which these characters suggest to Dr. Poteat's fertile mind—the importance of relaxation, ends and means, tired radicals, how to deal with cruelty, wealth and possessions, the claims of family, liberalism and orthodoxy, prejudice, forgiveness, suffering, loyalty, wisdom. To them all he brings a penetrating intellect, deep conviction, and a stout faith that the power of God is the power of love, and that the future is with the God of Love. "The final answer does not lie with man; God has spoken and will speak again."

MORGAN PHELPS NOYES

Central Presbyterian Church, Montclair, New Jersey.

Church, Law and Society. By GUSTAF AULÉN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948. pp. xvi-114. \$2.00.

In this book Gustaf Aulén, the distinguished Swedish churchman and theologian, sketches several central features of a Protestant Christian social philosophy. The venture into this field is greatly needed in Protestantism; and Bishop Aulén has

performed a real service in this brief statement of central notions. He is particularly concerned with the analysis of the relationship of Law and Gospel, and of Love and Justice; and with the interpretation of how the church is related to society at the point of responsibility for justice. In the concluding chapter he pleads eloquently for a deepening consciousness of the bond of unity among the churches as they confront the problems and perils of the present age. Reading this book is likely to be an interesting and refreshing experience for those who suppose that Reformation Christianity has no real social philosophy, and for those who suppose that the established churches are moribund in sectarianism, isolationism, and pride.

The law that Aulén discusses is of course wider and deeper than jurisprudence and legal codes. It is the law of God (p. 3). This law has been given to the church in and through the Word of God, but it is a law of universal validity, "superior to all human order and organizations, holy and inviolable" (p. 63). It is the foundation, the structural principle, of human society. Thus, the church has no right to view the law as having been abrogated by the gospel, so far as this life is concerned (cf. p. 70). To be sure, the law has no power unto salvation and it is not a way to God, for that power and that way is the gospel of love: but the law is the power "unto the establishment of human fellowship" (p. 62).

Aulén appears here and there to assign a largely negative function to law, for instance, that of controlling the destructive forces in humanity (cf. p. 63). At such times I wonder whether he views the state as a divine and elaborate mechanism contrived to set bounds to human iniquity, and as nothing positive and productive. This might well be part of an extreme dualism of law-gospel, justice-love. And, as I have said, such a dualism seems to me to be almost present here and there in this work: the law is constitutive of human community—the gospel leads us to God. Is human community, then, nothing that provides a clue or a pointer to the nature and existence of God? Does the moral order yield no suggestion of a higher, a divine order?

It is fairly apparent, however, that Aulén has no intention of embracing so sharp a dualism as this. He wants, in fact, particularly to show that gospel and law, love and justice are fully complementary to each other, and that neither is truly itself without the other. This is true because revelation embraces both law and gospel. It is a revelation of justice and love.

Failure to comprehend this is the radical defect of the natural-law theories of Roman Catholicism, on the one hand, and of Emil Brunner's thought on the other (cf. pp. 65ff.). There is no merely natural and rational basis for human community, just as there is no merely natural or rational theology. Failure in understanding this may lead to the idolization of a society or some of its main structures and principles. It may also lead to despair and disintegration when arbitrarily and sinfully absolutized institutions and values are dethroned and repudiated. At this point merely natural-law justifications of a social order issue in the denaturalization of all values. Moreover, the natural-law theories do not interpret rightly the relationship of justice and love. To view justice and love as antithetical—a position he ascribes to Brunner—is to distort the gospel. The gospel embraces both justice and love: all that justice lays upon heart and mind to do, the love of God gives us power and will to do (cf. p. 73).

Even in the state we must not separate the claims of justice from the power of love (cf. pp. 78 and 79). What power other than love can induce us to seek justice for neighbor and for "resident alien"? What else will give the church the

daring and the faith to speak out against injustice in high and mighty places? The law of justice and the gospel of love are given through and to the church; the church must therefore measure society and state by this Word, and declare the issue.

Bishop Aulén forcefully reminds us that the church itself is judged by this Word, and the church cannot excuse the drastic failures thereby revealed. A church that succumbs either to pietism or to modernism cannot rightly divide the word of truth: only a church committed to the radical and realistic gospel can discharge its responsibility to society and to God. Neither can a narrow and exclusive church minister to the world. Such a church has a bad conscience, and cannot therefore be a "living conscience of justice" in relation to society. The true church is confessional: it confesses one Lord, one gospel, one God and Father of us all (cf. p. 110).

In order to be the conscience of justice in and for society, the church cannot be merely a part of society (p. 108). The church will inevitably be colored by the environing culture: but the law in its members is not a product of culture—it is the will of God. Yet surely the pattern of relationships between church and society is complex; and it is also sometimes treacherous for the health and productivity of the church, especially if the society is an outwardly stable one, and the times are peaceful. Aulén gives us a dramatic picture of how the church came miraculously into the power of the gospel in the occupied countries during the recent war. But what will keep the church on its knees before its Lord and on its feet before all temporal power and persuasion, when the crises are far less dramatic but none the less real? How, for example, should the church express its responsibility for justice to oppressed minority groups in our own country? The tyrants in these works of injustice cannot really be singled out. Here we are dealing with deeply entrenched economic and social structures and principles, in the defense of which no one is holding a bayonet against the church, and yet the church yields over and over again to this defense. The church must preach justice: but with what works will it give flesh and blood to its preachments? Bishop Aulén's analysis of the relationships of church and society does not, I am afraid, throw much light upon complexities of this order.

JULIAN N. HARTT

Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

The Person and the Common Good. By JACQUES MARITAIN. Translated by JOHN J. FITZGERALD. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947. pp. 98. \$2.00.

Jacques Maritain is one of the most virile and brilliant of the neoscholastics, one of the few whose work is destined to live for a long time. His incessant productivity combines with his teaching at Toronto and his duties as French ambassador to the Vatican to furnish proof of a vigorous mind and a body inured to air travel.

Master of style though he is, Maritain always thinks in terms of scholastic categories which are technically exact, yet are far from intelligible to the unwary or untrained reader. For example, he deals in the book before us with the person as contrasted to the mere individual (or self). Until this distinction is made clear, Maritain's "personalism" is baffling. Maritain does not mean to say that there are two classes of beings—the individuals and the persons. Rather the two names designate two aspects of the "intellectual creature" (man, for example). As individual he is rather to be a part of the universe, a member of the natural order,

and is "willed and loved" for the sake of the whole to which he belongs; as person, he is willed and loved for himself. Thus "individual" designates man as means to the perfection of the whole; "person" designates man as end in himself. The individual is thought of in relation to the created order of nature; the person, in relation to the divine transcendent Whole, which is above all nature. The individual is a member of the natural order; the person is a member of the Kingdom of God, a supernatural order, "the separated common Good"—separate and distinct from nature. To quote Kant and Leibnitz at once, man is a citizen of two worlds, the realm of nature and the realm of grace.

The person, then, is "directly related to the absolute," and "derives from spirit," while the individual "derives from matter." Every man is both. "Evil arises when, in our action, we give preponderance to the individual aspect of our being." Hence, he argues, we must not reject all asceticism. In order to secure the rule of spirit over passion there must be discipline. But the individual aspect has rights which also must be recognized.

In the person there is a tendency to communion, as opposed to the mere collective wholes of individuals. Here is the difference, for example, between a church and a communist order of society. In the latter there may be a public good, but not a truly "common good," such as a society of persons receives and communicates by virtue of its membership in the Kingdom of Grace. The public good might be an individualistic materialism, shared by all. The common good is the "ethically good," and always refers the person "to the transcendent whole," where are found "the eternal goods and the supratemporal values from which human life is suspended."

Such is Maritain's message. It places the person above all temporal societies. One sign of the author's magnanimous mind is the fact that there is little in this meaty essay (save for references to the Holy Trinity) which would not be equally acceptable to a thoughtful Buddhist, Hindu, Mohammedan, Jew, or Protestant Christian, as well as to a Roman Catholic. Such anticipations of a larger ecumenicity are to be welcomed.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

The Beginning of Wisdom. BY EMILE CAILLIET. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1947. pp. 192. \$2.50.

Here is a book which combines charm and strength in an unusual way. The author is the Stuart Professor of Christian Philosophy at Princeton Theological Seminary and this volume represents his 1946-47 Otts Lectures at Davidson College, North Carolina. In general, it deals with the present tangled issues which have for some years confused Christian thinking. The author's foreword, "A Message to the Reader," declares that the book starts "from the specific human situation of the cultured man of good will," and that the reader will be led "through objections and problems until a right biblical perspective is restored and the case for commitment is stated with singleness of purpose." The book's jacket declares we have here "an answer to the spiritual confusion among the present generation."

Dr. Cailliet is fully alert to the challenge of naturalism which has been increasingly beating against the Christian world view, not only on the campus of the university but everywhere else. Against this he calls to mind, as a pitfall to be avoided, what Rosalind Murray aptly terms "the good pagan's failure." The author

is, of course, thoroughly familiar with the entire range of Christian thought through the ages, and if the truth be told, will be found midstream in Christian thinking. The book indicates here and there what might be called a tinge of Pascalian influence, and the author stresses constantly and surely the value of a biblical perspective as needful to "dispel illusions." He is careful not to discount the Old Testament, and is somewhat uneasy because "a new Marcionism today pervades the church." The last pages of *The Beginning of Wisdom*, affirming unshakably the sovereignty of God, seem to wish to rest the volume formally under the tremendous aegis of old-fashioned Presbyterian orthodoxy. Dramatically enough, the author correctly insists that the "path across the wilderness" is a path which Bunyan's Christian found "fenced on either side by the Wall of Salvation."

To me the charm of the book lies in its graceful style. One discovers here a cultured scholar who knows how to turn the flexible language and incisive thought of his native land into limpid but forceful English prose. Dr. Cailliet can write—and that, let it be said by one who knows, is not true of all scholars and theological professors, no matter how vast their other talents. Here we have clarity of style matched by strength of conviction. I especially enjoyed the abundant references that are made to French writers and the French classics of the past. There is a wealth of apt quotation, not only from authorities in the Christian household, but from other eminent Gallic thinkers who have impressed the world with their mental acumen. We are so used to having our own literary allusions throw us back among English men of letters, that it is a pleasure to find one who easily and fully gives rich references to Pascal or Diderot, or to Emile Mâle, or Péguy, or even Rabelais. Not that other authorities are not cited—Kierkegaard, Schiller, Kant, Whale, Whitehead—a great number of others is drawn upon. However, this is no collection of quotations, but the strong affirmative Christian creed for a Christian intellectual.

The book as a whole presents the keen scholarly insights of a man who is a thorough Christian and who knows from experience the way out through the wilderness. The seven chapters of the volume are: "Groping for Light," "The Challenge of Naturalism," "The Dilemma of Christian Scholarship," "A Charter for the Christian Scholar," "Toward a Biblical Perspective," "The Path Across This Wilderness," and "Doing the Truth." Christian thinkers, especially those who deal with youth or who have intellectual problems of their own, will find their thinking greatly clarified by this volume. It is very much worth reading.

NOLAN B. HARMON

Editor, RELIGION IN LIFE, New York City.

God and Men. By HERBERT H. FARMER. New York: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947. pp. 203. \$2.00.

This is an unusual series of Lyman Beecher Lectures. Here is no word on the art of preaching nor on the techniques of building up and leading a congregation—the main tasks laid on those of us who were lecturers on this foundation a generation ago. Dr. Farmer concentrates his attention on the minds of contemporary men and women, which he finds deeply at variance with the basic outlook of Christianity, and proceeds to deal with this opposition. Nothing could at the moment be more practically helpful to preachers and pastors.

The Christian faith moves in a realm of personal relations—God's relation to sinful men and their relations to one another. Science deals with the realm of things, and its attitudes possess contemporary minds and depersonalize their

thinking. A realm of persons is a realm of mutual claims—God's claims on men and their claims on one another. This word "claim" is Dr. Farmer's key to Christian thinking. Persons are bound to one another by such claims and yet are free of one another. Their reconciliation in a fellowship of loyalty and trust is the purpose of God in Christ.

One great value of this book is the acute analysis of our present impersonal thinking. Few of us realize how we succumb to it, for it is the mental climate in which we have been born and reared, and in which all our education is carried on. He deals with the naturalistic, the cultural, the vitalist, and the collectivist views of man—all of which deprive him of personal relations with God and also with fellow men, and do away with the Christian sense of obligation. Impersonalism in the study of history renders incredible God's "breaking into" it, as for example in his Self-disclosure in Jesus Christ. Dr. Farmer shares Brunner's conviction that much of current religion is a vague pantheism, rendering us comfortable in contemplating aesthetically a higher unity behind the welter of current events and the baffling phenomena of nature. "You mix yourself up with the landscape and call it religion." If preachers can make clear as sharply as does this book the difference between Christian faith and our hazy sentimental and idealistic thinking, they will at least pave the way for genuine vital faith in God.

A second value in this book is its precise and persuasive theological definition. Dr. Farmer has a gift of lucid and untechnical expression. This is invaluable for our work in the pulpit. Ministers will find him making exact and plain many convictions which are vague in their own minds and hence pathetically "woolly" in their speech. His treatment of the holiness and the love of God, of sin and its consequences, of God's saving acts in history, especially in Christ and the Church, of his meeting us in the brutal and agonizing scene at Calvary and so dealing realistically with the baffling circumstances of our world's tragic events—are cases in point. Read this book for a clarification of your thought and speech on your faith in God in Christ.

In his preface Dr. Farmer disclaims offering anything new; but he takes the old and renders it relevant and cogent. Those who know his admirable book on preaching, *The Servant of the Word*, one of the very best guides to men in the pulpit today—will find this book equally useful and inspiring as setting forth the basic convictions of the Christian preacher addressing himself to the minds of contemporaries.

HENRY SLOANE COFFIN

President Emeritus, Union Theological Seminary, Lakeville, Connecticut.

The Doctrine of Our Redemption. By NATHANIEL MICKLEM. New York: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948. pp. 155. \$1.50.

This little volume does not pretend to be a history of the doctrine of the atonement, nor does it offer any novel interpretation of the cross. Rather, it seeks to explain in as modern language as possible some of the typical views of redemption which have been held in the church. The author is a distinguished Congregational theologian in Britain who has taught both Old and New Testament and comes to his subject with a strong biblical emphasis.

"Redemption is deliverance from sin and uncleanness to purity and holiness" (p. 15). How has that taken place and in what does that consist? The hymn writers are quoted fully as much as the theologians in giving the answer. For

Micklem, the work of the Holy Spirit in us is not less important than the work of Christ for us. The author is eclectic in spirit and does not attempt to reduce redemption to one coherent conception. Irenaeus, Augustine, John of Damascus, Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Bunyan, and Wesley are all drawn upon for illuminating insights.

This reader was interested in the fact that a quite subordinate place was given to sacrifice. The author almost apologizes for the thinking of Anselm and assures us that his heart was in the right place despite his crude conceptions. Calvin's name is not mentioned. On the other hand, a valiant attempt is made to interpret the cosmic ideas of redemption in eastern theology. Strong emphasis is put on the objective factors in every theory. "We are not good because we feel good, and we are not saved or redeemed because of our emotional experiences" (p. 13). In describing *Christus Victor* Micklem writes, "To speak of 'demonic forces' is no more mythological, and is probably much more exact, than to speak of 'economic forces,' for there is no philosophical reason why there should not be disembodied evil intelligences, whereas an 'economic force' is a mere abstraction" (p. 83).

The volume is written in a fine devotional spirit without any concessions to the vocabulary of substitutionary satisfaction theories. We are reminded that "the blood is the life"; hence when it is said that men are saved by the blood of Christ this does not restrict it to his death. Most of the chapters could have been developed with exclusively biblical references as well as by appeal to the later theologians. And yet the whole is set more in the framework of the church's doctrine of atonement than of the messianic conceptions of the Bible. Because of the brevity of treatment it would not be fair to enter upon a criticism of details that seem misleading or inaccurate. In a longer exposition the author would probably have made more guarded statements. Suffice it to say that the volume is one which every minister will find both instructive and inspiring. It should stimulate thinking on the central aspects of faith.

CLARENCE T. CRAIG

Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

Preface to Ethical Living. By Robert E. Fitch. Haddam House (Association Press). \$1.25. "Describes the moral and spiritual malnutrition that is weakening our social order and prescribes as remedy for it a code of ethics that holds good in war and in peace, through prosperity and depression, on the farm, in the factory, and in the office, on campus, and in the classroom." The author was a Navy chaplain during the war and is now Dean of the Faculty at Occidental College, Los Angeles.

The Path of the Saint. Anonymous, with foreword by Edwin McNeill Poteat. Harper. \$2.50. "The aim of this book is twofold. First, to argue the validity of the work of spiritual researchers who have gone far enough to become the persons who are ideally known as saints. Second, to encourage people to become spiritual researchers with the hope that some of them may become saints."

Postlude to Skepticism. By Ralph Sadler Meadowcroft. Cloister Press, Louisville. \$2.50. "One of the most encouraging signs of the last decade has been the decline of skepticism." "The time is now opportune for an examination of the possibility of faith, and of the content of that faith. . . ."

Alternative to Futility. By Elton Trueblood. Harper. \$1.00. This little book, the third of the trilogy starting with *The Predicament of Modern Man*, develops the idea of "a creative society in miniature, a beloved community which may have small beginnings but can grow like the mustardseed," with suggestions on nourishing such fellowships.

The Christian Faith and Way. By Harris Franklin Rall. Abingdon-Cokesbury. 50¢ (paper). A useful presentation of basic Christian teaching for lay groups; questions for discussion and a bibliography.

The Church and the Churches. By

K. L. Carrick Smith. S.C.M. Press. 7s 6d. A wise book on working toward unity by full and appreciative recognition of the various distinctive patterns of Christian life and worship.

Frederick Denison Maurice. By Florence Higham. S.C.M. Press. 6s. The story of an outstanding Christian Socialist and educator of nineteenth-century England, who had "a vision of the Holy Catholic Church as the Kingdom of Christ on earth."

Benjamin Mosby Smith: 1811-1893. By Francis R. Flournoy. Richmond Press. \$2.00. The biography of a leader in the religious and educational life of nineteenth-century Virginia, who "saved Union Seminary (Richmond, Virginia) in her hour of desperate need" in the Reconstruction period. By his grandson, professor in The College of Emporia, Kansas.

Christianity Where Men Work. By Ralph Norman Mould. Friendship Press. Paper, 50¢. A live study course on the relevance of Christianity to labor-management relations, by an experienced Presbyterian leader of young people's conferences.

First Steps in Prayer. By Kermit R. Olsen. Revell. \$1.25. Glenn Clark calls this "about the best book with which earnest seekers (of prayer) can start."

Prayers for Young People. By Abigail Acker Johnson. Westminster. \$1.50. Intended for but not confined to the teen age; simply expressed and close to life; each prayer preceded by a related Scripture reading.

Rural Parish! By Anna Laura Gebhard. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.50. Selections from the journal of a bride, on the trials and achievements of her rural Minnesota. "A delightful story . . . conspicuously well done."

Revive Thy Church Beginning With Me. By Samuel M. Shoemaker. Harper. \$1.50. Recommended reading for Lent, but not confined thereto. A practical little book on fundamental principles of inner change, including a chapter on "the working cell."

The Negro Spiritual Speaks of Life and Death. By Howard Thurman. Harper. \$1.00. The Ingersoll Lecture on Immortality at Harvard, 1947. A brilliant and sensitive interpretation lifting this "art-form" to its "true plane in the realm of spirit."

A History of the World's Young Women's Christian Association. By Anna V. Rice. Woman's Press. \$2.00. "A history, not of the Young Women's Christian Association the world around, but of the world organization that unites and seeks to develop and extend the Movement in all lands." An important book in the field.

Pillars of Faith. By Nels F. S. Ferré. Harper. \$1.50. A leading theologian here writes for the layman. "Christian faith can be strong and stable only as it relies on all five pillars"—Jesus, the Holy Spirit, the Church, the Bible, experience.

Peace Is Our Business. By Harry K. Zeller, Jr. Brethren Publishing House, Elgin, Illinois. Sixteen sermons pointing out that "our world seems bent on doing business with Mars," calling upon us, under God, to "make peace our business."

Factors Affecting the Religion of College Students. By Robert O. Smith. Privately published; lithographed M.A. thesis. \$1.50. Study of personality and cultural factors involved; negative and positive factors on campus; different patterns in church-related, private, public institutions; statistical tables, summary of past research. Obtainable from the author. Lane Hall, University of Michigan.

The Mother's Role in Childhood Education: New England Concepts 1830-1860. By Anne L. Kuhn. Yale. \$3.00. An intriguing study of the beginnings of parent education in this country, as found in books and periodicals of the period.

A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life. By William Law. Westminster. \$2.00. Introduction by J. V. Moldenhawer. **Christian Nurture.** By Horace Bushnell. Yale. \$4.00. Introduction by Luther A. Weigle.

The reprinting of both these classics with able prefatory material is a cause for gratitude.

Meditations for Women. Edited by Jean Beaven Abernethy. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.00. Meditations for each day of the year, by twelve outstanding women, one for each month. Unusual and refreshing reading. Introduction by Dorothy Canfield Fisher.

The King Nobody Wanted. By Norman F. Langford. Westminster. \$2.50. The story of Jesus vividly told for boys and girls of upper elementary school age; based on the accounts in all four Gospels, excellently illustrated.

Men Called Him Master. By Elwyn Allen Smith. Westminster. \$2.00. The story of Jesus' ministry and the final events, told graphically for junior-high-school boys and girls. Fictional material is included to clarify the social and political issues and background, but there is close adherence to the Bible.

Good Times in the Rural Church. By Edward L. Schlingman. Christian Education Press, Philadelphia. \$1.25 (paper). Helpful practical suggestions for recreational activities from the experience of rural ministers.

Broken Homes. Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 135. Public Affairs Committee, 22 E. 38th St., New York. Useful popular discussion of marriage and divorce.